DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 393 910 TM 024 905

AUTHOR	Smith, David L.
TITLE	Analysis of Nevada School Accountability System (Based on NRS 385.347). Submitted to Nevada State Legislature.
INSTITUTION	Nevada State Dept. of Education, Carson City. Planning, Research and Evaluation Branch.
PUB DATE	Feb 95
NOTE	308p.
PUB TYPE	Reports - Evaluative/Feasibility (142)
EDRS PRICE	MF01/PC13 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS	*Academic Achievement; *Accountability; Data Analysis; Data Collection; *Economically Disadvantaged; Elementary Secondary Education; Gifted; Inservice Teacher Education; Institutional Characteristics; Limited English Speaking; Parent Participation; Program Effectiveness; *Public Schools; School Readiness; *State Legislation; *State Programs; Student Characteristics; Student Evaluation; Testing Programs; Test Results
IDENTIFIERS	*Nevada

ABSTRACT

During the 1993 session, the Nevada State Legislature enacted into law Nevada Revised Statute (NRS) 385.347, commonly known as the Nevada School Accountability Law. It requires all schools in Nevada to inform the public of the performance of public schools throughout the state. School accountability was accomplished through a system of reports described in this analysis. Handbooks for development of accountability reports were generated to specify data elements to appear in the reports. These data elements are also reviewed in this report. Comprehensive accountability reports for 332 schools and all 17 school districts for the 1992-93 school year were provided in a timely fashion. Statistical analyses investigated relationships between various school characteristics and statewide testing of student achievement. These analyses suggest the particular effectiveness of in-school programs and school-readiness programs that target low socioeconomic status children and children with English as a second language and programs to improve student attendance, parent participation, teacher continuing education, and student participation in programs for the gifted. Four appendixes present the state law, a review of the accountability program, tables of institutional and student characteristics, and tables from regression analyses. (Contains 7 tables, 12 tables in Appendix C, and 4 tables in Appendix D.) (SLD)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED 393 910

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

☑ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

DAVID L. SMITH

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)"

Analysis of Nevada School Accountability System (Based on NRS 385.347) Submitted to Nevada State Legislature

David L. Smith

Nevada Department of Education

MARY L. PETERSON
Superintendent of Public Instruction

KEITH RHEAULT
Deputy Superintendent

Planning, Research, and Evaluation Branch
KEVIN CROWE, *Director*

Capitol Complex, Carson City, Nevada 89710

TM024905

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

(O)-1905 (Rev. 2-95)

Analysis of Nevada School Accountability System (Based on NRS 385.347) Submitted to Nevada State Legislature

David L. Smith

February 1995

Planning, Research, and Evaluation Branch

Nevada Department of Education

NEVADA STATE BOARD OF EDUCATION

Jan Biggerstaff

Peggy Lear Bowen

Frank Brown

Terry Garcia-Cahlan

Islena Giron

Bill Hanlon

Liliam Hickey

Patricia Krajcech

Yvonne Shaw

David C. Sheffield

Gary Waters

Melissa Dooley, Student Representative

Table of Contents

Executive Summary 5

Introduction 7

Reports Requested from School Districts 8

Data Elements of School Accountability Reports 9

School Districts' Reporting on School Accountability 12

Table 1. Selected information appearing in school district's accountability reports. 14

Impact on School Districts 16

Table 2. Estimates of staff, work hours, and funds to be expended on school accountabiiity reports in 15 school districts during the present school year. 17

Relationships Between School Characteristics and Student Achievement . . . 18

Elementary School Analysis 19

Table 3. Direction of significant relationships between various school characteristics and the national percentile rank of schools' average score on Grade 3 sections of the CTBS/4. 20

Table 4. Direction of significant relationships between various school characteristics and the national percentile rank of schools' average score on Grade 6 sections of the CTBS/4. 22

Table 5. Direction of significant relationships between various school characteristics and the percentage of students competent in writing trait areas of Grade 6 Statewide Writing Examination. 22

Secondary School Analysis 23

Table 6. Direction of significant relationships between various school characteristics and the national percentile rank of schools' average score on Grade 9 sections of the CTBS/4. 24

Table 7. Direction of significant relationships between various school characteristics and the percentage of students competent in writing trait areas of Grade 9 Statewide Writing Examination. 24

Implications 25

Report Summary 27

Appendix A

Nevada School Accountability Law 30

Appendix B

Program of Accountability of School Districts: Review and Analysis . . 32

Appendix C

Table C1. Districts' school characteristics. 56
Table C2. Classrooms in districts. 57
Table C3. District elementary student performance. 59
Table C4. District secondary student performance. 60
Table C5. Elementary school characteristics. 61
Table C6. Elementary classrooms. 80
Table C7. Elementary student participation. 99
Table C8. Elementary student performance. 118
Table C9. Secondary school characteristics. 137
Table C10. Secondary classrooms. 148
Table C11. Secondary student participation. 159
Table C12. Secondary student performance. 170

Appendix D

Table D1. Partial correlations from Multiple Regression/Correlation analyses of relationships between school characteristics and national percentile rank of average CTBS scores at grades three and six. . . . 180

Table D2. Partial correlations from Multiple Regression/Correlation analyses of relationships between school characteristics and national percentile rank of average CTBS scores at grade nine. 181

Table D3. Partial correlations from Multiple Regression/Correlation analyses of relationships between school characteristics and the percentage of sixth grade students considered competent in writing traits on the statewide Writing Exam. 182

Table D4. Partial correlations from Multiple Regression/Correlation analyses of relationships between school characteristics and the percentage of ninth grade students considered competent in writing traits on the statewide Writing Exam. 183

Executive Summary

During the 1993 session, the Nevada State Legislature enacted into law Nevada Revised Statute 385.347, commonly known as the Nevada School Accountability Law. It requires all school districts in Nevada to inform the public on the performance of public schools throughout the state. School accountability was accomplished through a system of reports described in the present analysis. Individual school reports were provided to parents and made available to others. School district reports provided information about each school in the district to media sources and other interested groups or individuals.

Handbooks to guide the development of accountability reports were generated by the Nevada Department of Education after meetings with a broad range of statewide educational, legislative, parental, news media, and private representatives. The handbooks specified data elements to appear in the reports based upon the information required by the law and the input of these various groups. These data elements are reviewed in the present report.

Comprehensive accountability reports for 332 schools and all 17 school districts for the 1992-93 school year were provided by the school districts in a timely fashion. *The quality of the reports from each district was regarded as high, and the bulk of the data requested in the handbook appeared in the reports generated by each district* (see *Table 1*). A school-by-school summary of various data elements appears in *Appendix C* of this report. In the absence of state funding for school accountability, school districts expended considerable effort and expense in generating the reports. Estimates of the impact of producing reports for the 1993-94 school year are listed in *Table 2*.

Statistical analyses reported here investigated relationships between various school characteristics and statewide testing of student achievement. It should be noted that many of the findings that could be uncovered in analyzing individual student data may be obscured since the present analyses compare information aggregated at the school-level. Although further analyses are recommended in later accountability reports, the present school-level analyses suggest the particular effectiveness of:

- in-school programs and school-readiness preschool programs that target low socioeconomic children and children with English as a second language;
- programs to improve student attendance rates;
- programs to encourage parental attendance at school conferences and involvement in their children's education;

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

- programs to encourage teachers to continue their own academic achievement; and

- programs that encourage student involvement in gifted/talented and advance placement programs.

Since the accountability program was in its pilot year, it is not possible at this time to ascertain how school districts and the State Department will make use of the information collected to improve the performance of various schools. Each school district provided the State Department with an evaluative report on the impact of the accountability program (see *Appendix B*), but these reports were generated only shortly after the school reports were generated, so school district follow-up is difficult to determine. Review of the districts' future effectiveness reports should provide more information regarding district efforts to follow-up the accountability findings. Also, the impact of the accountability information in guiding State Department efforts at school improvement should be considered in future analyses.

In continuing the school accountability process, legislative support for the following will be critical in assuring the usefulness of the mandate:

- providing funds for the Nevada Department of Education to develop a computerized system for standardizing school districts' calculation of information and generating school reports;

- providing funds to school districts to offset the financial impact of providing such reports to the public; and

- reducing the sheer amount of required information.

With regard to the last recommendation, particularly problematic is the listing of student achievement results from various measures at each grade. Reporting multiple student test results at each grade provides parents with a voluminous, and perhaps overwhelming amount of information. Required student achievement reporting should be restricted to only those grades and subjects contained in the statewide student assessment program. Likewise, student advancement at most schools is fairly consistent in grades beyond first grade and may not need to be reported for all grades.

During the 1993 session, the Nevada State Legislature amended Nevada Revised Statute 385.347 to require all school districts in Nevada to inform the public on the performance of individual public schools throughout the state. Previously, information was provided at the district, rather than the school, level. School accountability is to be accomplished through a system of reports to the public. The School Accountability Law is reproduced in *Appendix A*.

The Board of Trustees of each school district in the State annually is required to:

- report to the public during March concerning school site accountability information;
- submit school accountability reports to the State Board of Education on or before April 15; and
- submit to the State Board of Education, on or before June 15, a separate report summarizing the effectiveness of the district's program of accountability during the school year and a description of the efforts the district has made to correct deficiencies identified in the report.

The accountability reports to the public must contain information concerning:

- educational goals and objectives;
- comparisons of student achievement for the current school year with previous school years;
- ratios of students to teachers and other data concerning licensed and unlicensed employees of the school district;
- comparisons of teacher assignments with the qualifications and licensure of teachers;
- expenditures per pupil, set forth individually for each source of funding;
- curriculum employed by the school district, including any special programs for students at an individual school;
- records of attendance and advancement of students and graduation rates in each high school;
- efforts to increase communication with parents of students; and
- other information as directed by the State Superintendent of Public Instruction.

The School Accountability Law charges the State Superintendent of Public Instruction, in consultation with representatives of various educational associations in the State, with prescribing the forms for the reports and ensuring the implementation of a uniform system of reporting that provides comparable information for schools across the state. The State Superintendent is required to analyze the information submitted to the State Board and report to the Legislature, on or before February 1 of each year, concerning the effectiveness of the program of school accountability.

In Fall 1993, the Nevada State Department of Education developed a School Accountability Handbook for use by the local school districts in preparing their public school accountability reports. The handbook represented efforts by the Department of Education to address the charge of implementing a uniform system of reporting comparable accountability information for schools across the State. It also reflected the considerable efforts of educators and concerned citizens across the State of Nevada.

Reports Requested from School Districts

The Handbook requested three sets of reports.

- The first set of reports, *Individual School Accountability Reports*, were developed for individual schools and each contained information about the school and the district as a whole. These reports were distributed to parents of students from each school.

- The second set of reports, *District-wide School Accountability Reports*, contained information about each school in the district and the district as a whole. These reports were distributed to local news media, libraries and various local meeting places, the Legislative Counsel Bureau, and to other individuals who requested the information.

The two sets of reports are summarized in the present report.

- The third reports by districts required an analysis of the accountability process, any school-level exemplary or problematic programs in the district, and the school district's efforts to address any deficiencies noted. These reports were reviewed by a panel of educational scholars from both University of Nevada campuses. Their report appears in *Appendix B*.

Typically, a separate Individual School Accountability Report was required for each school in a district. School Accountability Reports were provided for six complete (elementary/secondary) schools, 222 elementary schools, and 104 secondary schools. There were, however, some exceptions from the requirement of each school providing an Individual School Report. Schools with an average enrollment of less than eight students per grade in the previous year were not required to produce an Individual School Accountability Report. Twenty-one schools, about 6 percent of regular schools, were considered too small for Individual School Accountability Reports. The small schools ranged from total enrollments of five students to 56 students, with average total enrollments of 23 students.

If there were more than one such small school in a district, the district was required to combine the information from those schools into a Small Schools Accountability Report. Thirteen of the 21 schools were reported in such reports. If there was only one such school in a district, that school was exempt from generating the Individual School report. However, the information for all such schools was included in district statistics reported in the Individual School Accountability Reports and in the District-Wide School Accountability Report.

Also, five special education schools were exempt from providing Individual School Accountability Reports for the March, 1994, reporting period. A separate Handbook is being considered for reporting performance indicators for special education schools for the March, 1996 reporting period. However, the information for all such schools must be included in district statistics used in the Individual School Accountability Reports and in the District-Wide School Accountability Report.

School officials were requested to take steps to assure that the information contained in the Individual School Accountability Reports is accessible to parents who speak primarily in Spanish. This was accomplished by holding meetings with translation for such parents or printing school reports in Spanish.

Data Elements of School Accountability Reports

The actual data elements found in sections of the Handbook were developed initially through review of the practical considerations in complying with the School Accountability Law, review of information presently provided to the Department by Nevada school districts, review of efforts of other states with accountability programs in place, and review of recommendations by an earlier statewide committee formed in 1989 to address district-level accountability reporting. The initial set of data elements and definitions was then modified from review of recommendations made by two statewide committees formed specifically to address the topic of school accountability: the Nevada Forum on School Accountability and the Nevada Technical Advisory Committee on School Accountability.

The statewide Forum on School Accountability was convened in fall, 1993 to address the requirements and issues involved with developing a school accountability system. The Nevada Forum was comprised of representatives from fourteen school districts, the Legislature, the Nevada State Education Association, the Nevada Press Association, the Nevada Association of School Administrators, the Legislative Counsel Bureau, the Nevada School Boards

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Association, the Nevada Parent Teachers Association, the Nevada State Board of Education, private citizens, the University of Nevada, Far West Laboratory for Educational Research and Development, and the Nevada Department of Education. Representatives from all school districts and from the business community were invited to participate in the Forum.

The report of the Forum's comments and recommendations was forwarded for consideration to the Technical Advisory Committee on School Accountability. The Technical Advisory Committee met in fall, 1993 and 1994, and was responsible for making comments and recommendations to the State Superintendent on technical aspects of collecting uniform, comparable information from schools in the 17 school districts in Nevada. The Committee was comprised originally of representatives from eight school districts, the Nevada Association of School Administrators, the Legislative Counsel Bureau, the Nevada State Board of Education, the Nevada State Education Association, the Nevada Association of School Boards, and the Nevada Department of Education.

A large number of data elements were considered for inclusion in the accountability reports. In choosing among the data elements, it became necessary to find a balance between all of the potential information available and efforts to keep critical information from being obscured in the accountability reports by lengthy tables of statistics. Undoubtedly, there are certain data elements and information of interest to educators or to certain segments of the populace that did not appear in the Handbook. In the end, the requirements of the School Accountability Law and judgements about the information of greatest concern to most parents of Nevada's school children took precedence in making final decisions on the data elements featured in the Handbook.

The statistical and textual information requested on the *Individual School Accountability* reports concerned the school and the district as a whole for School Year 1992-94 and included:

- **School's Name**, **Principal's Name**, and **School Telephone Number**;
- **Principal's Highlights** to review or list indicators of a school's performance for the previous school year, such as: special, enrichment, remediation, or counseling programs; state and/or national recognition for schools; various student awards and performance indicators; grant awards and school-community partnerships; and/or any other indicators of school climate (e.g., information from School Improvement activities);
- measurable/objectively identifiable **Progress Toward Goals**;
- **Enrollment**, **Transiency Rates**, and **Annual Change in Enrollment**;

- **Daily Attendance Rate** and **Advancement Rates** (promotion) by grades K-8;
- **Dropout Rates** for grades 9-12;
- **Counselor/Student Ratios** for schools and **Teacher/Student Ratios** for grades K-6;
- **Average Class Sizes** for core areas in grades 7-12;
- **Teacher's Experience** and **Teacher Degrees;**
- **Percentage of Teachers Completely Within Area of License and Endorsement** and, for grades 7-12, **Percentage of Classes in Core Areas Taught by Teachers Outside Areas of License and Endorsement;**
- **Average National Percentile Rank** for each grade on the reading, mathematics, and language sections of the state-required standardized tests, and the **Percentages of Students in the National Top and Bottom Quarter** in each grade;
- **Percentage of Students Proficient for Each Writing Trait** on the statewide writing exam;
- **Percentage of Students Passing Each Area of High School Proficiency Exam;**
- **Percentage of Graduating Class that Took College Entrance Exams** and **Average Scores;**
- results of other district-wide norm referenced or criterion referenced tests;
- **Percentage of Total Enrollment Participating in Special Programs** as listed in the Handbook;
- **Percentage of Students Whose Parents Attended Formally Scheduled Parent-Teacher Conferences** and other parental involvement indicators; and
- **Expenditures Per Student in Areas of Instruction, Administration, Building Operation, Staff Support, and Student Support** and **Sources of Revenues and Resources.**

Most of this information also was required for the *District-wide School Accountability Reports*. The school name, principal's name, and school telephone number on the individual school reports were replaced with the school district's name, superintendent's name, and district office telephone number. The principal's highlights and school progress toward goals on the school reports were replaced by **Superintendent's Review, District Highlights**, and district **Progress Toward Goals**. The district-wide reports also were to include the **Secondary Curriculum** listings for grades 7-12. Otherwise, the district-wide reports included all school-level reports' information for each school and the district as a whole.

Some note should be made of areas where the above information contrasts with the information requested by the NRS 385.347 revised. One element of the law specifies pupil achievement for each *age* and *grade level*. Given the amount of student achievement information reported at grade levels, the decision was made in the School Accountability Technical Advisory Committee to eliminate reporting at the age-level since much of this information would be redundant with grade-level reporting.

NRS 385.347 also specified the ratio of pupils to teachers *at each grade level*. The information above requested teacher/student ratios for grades K-6 only. At the secondary level, the decision was made that, since students are enrolled in different classes at each grade level, average class sizes in English, Mathematics, Science, and Social Science classes would be the most meaningful teacher/student size information for the public.

Finally, NRS 385.347 specified that *graduation rates* in each high school should be reported. Graduation rates are often calculated by considering the percentage of ninth graders from three years before who graduated in the current graduating class. Most school districts in the country do not track their students over this time period, and those that do generally neglect information on students who have arrived to their district during the three year time period. In Nevada, graduation rates used to be calculated by dividing the number of graduates by the number of ninth graders from three years ago. In a state like Nevada with high migration rates and high levels of growth, it was possible to achieve graduation rates over 100 percent. Given the problems most districts and states encounter with determining graduation rates, graduation rates were replaced by annual school *dropout rates* overall and for grades 9-12.

School Districts' Reporting on School Accountability

School districts submitted their Individual School and District-wide Accountability reports in a timely fashion by March, 1994. The districts deserve a great deal of credit for the high quality, informative reports generated in a

brief period of time and without any additional state funding during the pilot year for school accountability reporting. The reports were received by the State Department of Education in a proper fashion, and copies have been transferred to the Legislative Council Bureau for their review.

Selected statistical information for districts and schools in each district appears in *Appendix C*. *Tables C1* through *C4* provide district information. *Tables C5* (see pp. 61-79) and *C9* (pp. 137-147) provide selected *school characteristics* for elementary schools and secondary schools, respectively. *Tables C6* (pp. 80-98) and *C10* (pp. 148-158) provide *classroom information* for elementary schools and secondary schools, respectively. *Tables C7* (pp. 99-117) and *C11* (pp. 159-169) provide *percentages of enrollment participating in special programs* for elementary and secondary schools. *Tables C8* (pp. 118-136) and *C12* (pp. 170-178) provide *student achievement* information for elementary and secondary schools. *Dashes* indicate that the information did not apply to the school. *N.R.* indicates that the information was not reported on the on the school reports. On the district *Tables C1* through *C4*, however, information marked *N.R.* often was provided on the district reports, but some districts either segregated elementary and secondary information or broke information up by grades. On the district tables in *Appendix C*, some data for districts was estimated, as noted on the tables, by combining information from grades or schools when possible.

Table 1 in this section reviews the required information that did or did not appear in districts' school reports. A review of this table suggests that the school districts did an excellent job of providing relatively comprehensive reports to the public. Y's indicate that the information did appear in all school reports. Bolded N's indicate that the information did not appear in school reports. Y/N's indicate that the information was provided in some, but not all, reports or that the information was given for some, but not all, appropriate grades.

Most of the Y/N's reflect understandable omissions. For example, most districts reported advancement by grade on their elementary reports where advancement is a common consideration, especially in kindergarten and first grade. However, many neglected to indicate advancement in grades seven and eight on their secondary reports. Likewise, districts reported class sizes for grades on their elementary reports, but some neglected the grade six class sizes in their secondary schools where sizes of core areas' courses were listed. For special program participation, some districts listed most, but not all, programs. For parents attending parent/teacher conferences, not all districts had such information available, especially in secondary schools, for the already completed school year reported.

All districts reported percentile ranks of the average CTBS scores and the percent of students scoring in the national top and bottom quartile. On the

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Table 1. Selected information appearing in school district's accountability reports.

REPORT ITEM	CARSON	CHURCHILL	CLARK	DOUGLAS	ELKO	ESMERALDA	EUREKA	HUMBOLDT
PROGR'S/GOAL	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
ENROLLMENT	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
TRANSIENCY	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
ENR. CHANGE	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
ATTEND. RATE	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
ADVANCEMENT	Y/N	Y	Y/N	Y	Y/N	N	Y/N	Y/N
DROPOUT	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
C'SLOR/STUD'T	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
CLASS SIZES	Y	Y	Y/N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y/N
T'CHER EXPER.	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
T'CHER DEG.	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
T'CHER IN LIC.	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
CLASS'TAUGHT OUT LIC.	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
SPEC.PR'GRAM	Y/N	Y	Y/N	Y	Y	Y/N	Y/N	Y/N
PARENT INVOL.	Y/N	Y	Y/N	Y	Y/N	Y	Y	Y
CTBS/4 %ILE RANK	Y/N	Y	Y/N	Y/N	Y	Y	Y	Y/N
CTBS/4 TOP & BOTTOM QTR.	Y/N	Y	Y/N	Y/N	Y	Y	Y	Y
WRITING EXAM	Y	Y/N	Y/N	Y	Y	Y	Y/N	Y
PROFICIENCY EXAM	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
COL'EGE EXAM	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
EXPENDITURES	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y
REVENUES	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y

Table 1. Selected information appearing in school district's accountability reports. (Cont.)

REPORT ITEM	LA ND ER	LIN CO LN	LY ON	MIN ER AL	NY E	PE RS HIN	ST OR EY	WA SH OE	WH. PIN E
PROGR'S/GOAL	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y/N	Y	Y	Y
ENROLLMENT	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
TRANSIENCY	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
ENR. CHANGE	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
ATTEND. RATE	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
ADVANCEMENT	Y/N	Y/N	Y	Y	Y/N	Y	Y	Y/N	Y
DROPOUT	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y/N	Y	Y	Y	Y
C'SLOR/STUD'T	Y	Y/N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
CLASS SIZES	Y/N	Y	Y	Y/N	Y	Y/N	Y/N	Y/N	Y/N
T'CHER EXPER.	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
T'CHER DEG.	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
T'CHER IN LIC.	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
CLASS'TAUGHT OUTSIDE LIC.	Y	Y/N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y/N
SPEC.PR'GRAM	Y	Y	Y/N	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y/N
PARENT INVOL.	Y	Y	Y	Y/N	Y/N	Y	Y	Y/N	Y/N
CTBS/4 %ILE RANK	Y/N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
CTBS/4 TOP & BOTTOM QTR.	Y/N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
WRITING EXAM	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y/N
PROFICIENCY EXAM	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N
COL'EGE EXAM	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N
EXPENDITURES	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
REVENUES	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y

Y/N indications for the two CTBS/4 categories, however, not all grades results were provided. For these Y/N districts, the state mandated test results in grades three, six, and nine were reported.

Impact on School Districts

The State of Nevada provided no additional funds to support the accountability program. Each school district was responsible for finding existing staff-time to calculate the information needed and to develop the reports' designs. Printing and distribution of the reports were carried out by each school district using available funds. Given these considerations, the high quality of reports generated in the pilot year suggests considerable efforts expended by the school districts.

In July, 1994, 15 of Nevada's 17 school districts submitted estimates for the hours and costs of providing the accountability reports for the present year. *Table 2* provides a summary of the 15 school districts' estimates from the impact survey. Among 14 of the districts, the estimates of fiscal costs totalled over $353,172. Lincoln's estimate of the hours needed were the highest of any district, but most of the hours were for clerical and support staff. Washoe's estimate of costs was low for a district of it's size, but this is due to under-reporting salary information.

Another aspect of the impact survey was to get feedback on the accountability process. Most districts noted the time, effort, and expenditures involved in generating the reports, and believed that some state funding should be involved. Many felt that there was too much data required in the reports, especially the requirement to report various testing results at every grade. Other remarks suggested that indicators for goals and objectives, revenues and expenditures, parental involvement, and other measures be reviewed.

A frequent indication on the impact surveys was that more accurate and uniform reports could be generated much quicker with statewide training and software designed to conduct calculations and produce uniform school reports across districts. In Fall, 1993, the State Department of Education formally requested funds for a computerized program that would conduct all calculations for reporting and print school and district reports for each of Nevada's school districts. Funding was denied by the Interim Finance Committee in January, 1994, but the request for such a system has been included in a budget request to the State Legislature in 1995.

A number of other school district comments and suggestions for improving the accountability system were included in reports by each district to

Table 2. *Estimates of staff, work hours, and funds to be expended on school accountability reports in 15 school districts during the present school year.*

SCHOOL DISTRICT	UNDUPLICATED # OF STAFF	HOURS OF STAFF WORK	FUNDS TO BE EXPENDED
CARSON	6.5	158	NR
CHURCHILL	20.0	379	$ 9,677.22
CLARK	NR	1,744	$220,630.00
DOUGLAS	24.0	292	$ 9,628.50
ELK0	12.0	504	$ 17,132.80
ESMERALDA	2.0	52	$ 2,100.00
EUREKA	45.0	300	$ 9,760.00
HUMBOLDT	14.0	390	$ 9,779.00
LANDER	14.0	290	$ 10,924.00
LINCOLN	17.0	3,306	$ 9,352.00
LYON	37.0	360	$ 12,577.00
MINERAL	8.0	208	$ 9,800.50
NYE	34.0	373	$ 15,361.00
PERSHING	10.0	111	$ 3,558.00
WASHOE	22.0	1,136	$ 12,892.49

the State Board of Education and the State Superintendent as required by NRS 385.347. The items to be included in this report were listed in Part III of the Handbook. They included:

- areas where required information was not available for the school reports and plans for providing that information in the future;
- impact of the accountability reporting and recommendations for improving the accountability process;
- identification of exemplary school sites, evidence for such an identification, and model programs or activities believed to be

responsible for the school's exemplary performance;

- indication of school sites where areas of improvement were identified, evidence for the area of improvement needs, and district efforts to impact those areas at the site; and

- any district-wide areas for improvement and projected efforts to be enacted in the future.

In September, 1994, the Nevada Department of Education commissioned a panel of 10 scholars from the Colleges of Education at the two Universities of Nevada to review and comment on these reports. Their review looked at the districts' evaluation of the accountability process, exemplary sites, sites with areas for improvement, and district plans. As noted in introductory comments, a copy of this panel's review appears in *Appendix B* of the present report.

Relationships Between School Characteristics and Student Achievements

To study the relationship between various school characteristics and student academic achievement at the schools, simultaneous multiple regression/correlation analyses were conducted for elementary and secondary schools in Nevada. The data analyzed in these comparisons are school-level rather than individual student-level information. Since the analyses are at the school-level, smaller schools are counted equally to larger schools. Further, much of the differences that would be apparent in analyzing individual student scores, will be reduced in these analyses since the data are grouped by school. The development of an automated statewide student record system (the SMART system) will put in place the data system to serve these needs of the Nevada Department of Education and the Legislature.

Another feature of the present analyses should be mentioned here. *More reliable findings are expected at the lower grade levels* where a greater number of schools provide information. Statistically, since schools are treated as individuals in the analyses, the larger the "n," the greater the likelihood of reliable findings. Perhaps more important, the large number of elementary schools each serve a smaller geographical area and are more likely to preserve the impact of influential socioeconomic and cultural characteristics. The effect of such characteristics tend to be removed or "averaged" out of the data from the smaller number of secondary schools which receive students from a number of different elementary schools.

Finally, the review in this section is geared toward the lay reader's understanding of the principal relationships between school characteristics and academic achievement indicators. Readers interested in the actual correlation

numbers will find such information in *Tables D1-D4* in *Appendix D*. These tables list all school variables analyzed, including those that did not show statistically significant relationships. *Tables D1-D4* provide a summary of the partial correlations between school characteristics and achievement indicators. For those who review those tables, a partial correlation considers all the other school variables and reports the relationship with the particular school characteristic after consideration of the other school characteristics.

Initial summaries for the student achievement variables appear in *Tables 3-7* of this section. Each table lists the direction of the partial correlation for each school characteristic that was statistically significant ($p < .05$) in the characteristic's relationship with the student achievement variable. The directions of partial correlations listed in parentheses for certain school characteristics slightly missed reaching a statistically significant level ($p > .05$, but $< .10$), but they are listed only if such characteristics were related to other student achievement data in the other analyses in that section (e.g., grade 3 CTBS/4).

A *positive* relationship indicates that as the value of the school variable increases (e.g., increases in attendance rate), the value of the student achievement variable also increases (e.g., increases in grade 3 reading scores). A *negative* relationship indicates that as the school variable increases (e.g., increases in percentage of students participating in free/reduced lunch), the student achievement variable *decreases* (e.g., decreases in grade 3 language scores).

Elementary School Analyses

At the elementary school-level, regression analyses were conducted on:

- the reading, math, and language sections of the Comprehensive Test of Basic Skills (CTBS/4) for third and sixth grades; and
- the four writing characteristics of the Grade Six Writing Examination.

The CTBS/4 analyses compare the national percentile rank of each school's average score in each section of the exam. The Grade Six Writing Examination analyses compare the percent of students determined competent in each writing characteristic.

For the third grade CTBS/4, analyses were conducted on information from 212 elementary schools. Performance on all three sections -- reading, mathematics, and language -- **increased** with: a) increased percentages of students enrolled in gifted/talented programs; b) increased school attendance rates; and c) increased percentages of students whose parents attended the schools' first parent/teacher conferences. Performance on all three sections of the CTBS/4 in the third grade **decreased** with: a) increased percentages of

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Table 3. *Direction of significant relationships between various school characteristics and the national percentile rank of schools' average score on Grade 3 sections of the CTBS/4*

Characteristics	Gr.3 Reading	Gr.3 Math	Gr.3 Language
% Econ. Disadvan.	NEGATIVE	NEGATIVE	NEGATIVE
% Gifted/Talented Ed	POSITIVE	POSITIVE	POSITIVE
Attendance Rate	POSITIVE	POSITIVE	POSITIVE
% Teachers with B.A. Degree Only	NEGATIVE	NEGATIVE	NEGATIVE
Parents/Teachers Conference Attendance	POSITIVE	POSITIVE	POSITIVE
Transiency Rates	NEGATIVE	NEGATIVE	
% Teachers Teaching within License		NEGATIVE	NEGATIVE
Enrollment	(positive)	POSITIVE	
Per Pupil Expenditure for Instruction		NEGATIVE	(negative)
% Teachers Teaching 10yrs. and Beyond	POSITIVE		
% English as Second Language	NEGATIVE		

Note: A positive relationship indicates that as the value of the school variable increases, the achievement variable increases. A negative relationship indicates that as the value of a school variable increases, the achievement variable decreases.

economically disadvantaged students, as indicated by percentages on free/reduced lunch programs; and b) increased percentages of teachers who held only a baccalaureate degree (as opposed to a master's or doctorate).

Third grade reading and mathematics performance **increased** as school enrollment increased and **decreased** as the school's transience rates increased. Third grade reading **increased** as the percentage of teachers teaching 10 years and beyond increased and **decreased** as the percentage of English as Second Language students increased. Third grade reading showed a negative zero-order correlation and a positive partial correlation with the percent change in schools' enrollment.

Interestingly, third grade mathematics and language performance **decreased** as the percent of teachers teaching within license increased and as the per pupil expenditure for instruction increased. Teachers at the elementary level who were counted as not teaching within their license areas were those teachers who were teaching with "provisional licenses." The provisional licenses indicate the need to complete certain courses and test requirements. They need not indicate that these elementary teachers are not qualified to teach in elementary schools. Likewise, the increased per pupil expenditure for instruction may reflect increased spending on instructional programs at schools that are likely to score lower on standardized achievement tests in math and language for reasons such as lower socioeconomic factors or higher numbers of non-English speaking students.

Such findings also illustrate a potential limitation of the present analyses. Counting data at the school-level with all schools counting equally allows rural schools' data to have an impact, but it can also have some less desirable effects on the findings here. In the present case for teacher licensure, the percentages at smaller schools are heightened by only a few cases of teachers with provisional licenses. In two of the schools contacted, one of five teachers had a provisional license to teach special education, and the other school had one of 13 teachers with a provisional special education license. Further, the adverse grade three achievement results for percentage of elementary teachers teaching within license were influenced by seven rural elementary schools.

In the sixth grade CTBS/4 results, analyses were conducted on 135 schools. The number of schools were fewer than in the third grade analyses primarily because elementary schools in Clark County, Nevada's largest district, tend to end at the fifth grade, and most sixth grade students are sent to a smaller group of "sixth grade centers."

Like the third grade results, sixth grade reading, mathematics, and language performance on the CTBS/4 **Increased** with increases in the percentage of students in gifted/talented programs and increases in the percent of students whose parents attended the schools' first parent/teacher conferences. Also, performance in all three areas for the sixth grade, like the third grade, **decreased** as the percentage of economically disadvantaged students increased. At the sixth grade, increased percentages of students in migrant education were related to **decreased** performance in all three areas. Reading performance **decreased** as school enrollment increased. Reading performance **Increased** as the sixth grade teacher/student ratio increased.

Results on the sixth grade Writing Examinations were derived from comparisons of 124 schools. Each writing trait -- voice, organization, ideas, and conventions **Increased** with increases in a) the percentage in gifted/ talented programs; b) per pupil expenditures for instruction; and, again interestingly, c) sixth grade student/teacher ratios. All four writing trait areas

Table 4. *Direction of significant relationships between various school characteristics and the national percentile rank of schools' average score on Grade 6 sections of the CTBS/4*

Characteristics	Gr.6 Reading	Gr.6 Math	Gr.6 Language
% Econ. Disadvan.	NEGATIVE	NEGATIVE	NEGATIVE
% Gifted/Talented Ed	POSITIVE	POSITIVE	POSITIVE
% Migrant Education	NEGATIVE	NEGATIVE	NEGATIVE
Parents/Teachers Conference Attendance	POSITIVE	POSITIVE	POSITIVE
Enrollment	NEGATIVE		
Grade 6 Teacher/ Student Ratio	POSITIVE		

For definition of positive and negative, see note on *Table 3.*

Table 5. *Direction of significant relationships between various school characteristics and the percentage of students competent in writing trait areas of Grade 6 Statewide Writing Examination*

Characteristics	Grade 6 Voice	Grade 6 Organiza-tion	Grade 6 Ideas	Grade 6 Conven-tion
Per Pupil Expenditure for Instruction	POSITIVE	POSITIVE	POSITIVE	POSITIVE
% Gifted/Talented Ed	POSITIVE	POSITIVE	POSITIVE	POSITIVE
Transiency Rate	NEGATIVE	NEGATIVE	NEGATIVE	NEGATIVE
Grade 6 Student/ Teacher Ratio	POSITIVE	POSITIVE	POSITIVE	POSITIVE
% Teachers Teaching within License	POSITIVE		POSITIVE	(positive)
% Special Education		(negative)	NEGATIVE	NEGATIVE
Enrollment		NEGATIVE	NEGATIVE	(negative)

For definition of positive and negative, see note on *Table 3.*

decreased with increases in school transiency rates. The percentage of sixth grade students competent in voice, ideas, and convention traits **increased** as the percent of teachers teaching within license at schools increased. The percentage competent in organization, ideas, and conventions **decreased** with increases in school enrollments and in the percentage of students in special education at the schools.

Secondary School Analyses

As noted above, the decreased number of secondary schools and the reduced influence of homogeneous socioeconomic and cultural factors on averaged school data should create difficulties in finding reliable relationships between school characteristics and achievement performance. A look at *Tables D2* and *D4* in *Appendix D* reveals a number of correlations that failed to reach significance at the $p<.05$ level, yet were higher than those that were significant for elementary schools in the other two tables in *Appendix D*. Further, at the secondary school-level, regression analyses were conducted that are not reviewed in this report since the analyses *failed* to provide significant information. These analyses were conducted on: a) the percentage of students passing each section of the Nevada High School Proficiency Test for 56 schools; b) the percentage of students at each school that took the ACT and the SAT College Entrance Tests for 53 schools; c) the average scores of schools on the ACT Composite and the SAT-Verbal and SAT-Mathematics sections; and d) the dropout rates for 62 schools.

The regression analyses reviewed in this section were conducted on:

- the national percentile rank of schools' average scores in the reading and mathematics sections of the Comprehensive Test of Basic Skills (CTBS/4) for the ninth grade in 57 schools; and
- the percent of students determined competent in each of the four writing characteristics of the Grade Nine Writing Examination for 55 schools.

In conducting these analyses, the percentage of teachers teaching within license area was removed as a variable and replaced with the number of classes taught in core areas by teachers outside of their license area. Also, the percentage of students participating in free/reduced lunch programs, a significant variable in the elementary analyses, was removed as a variable in the secondary level analyses. Most research comparing free/reduced lunch programs in elementary and secondary schools suggest that this variable is often a poor indicator of socioeconomic status at the secondary level since many older students refuse to participate in the program. Also, Nevada high schools in Clark and White Pine counties do not provide these luncheon programs, and Mineral County did not report participation levels.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Table 6. *Direction of significant relationships between various school characteristics and the national percentile rank of schools' average score on Grade 9 sections of the CTBS/4*

Characteristics	Gr.9 Reading	Gr.9 Math
% Participating in English As a Second Language Programs	NEGATIVE	
Attendance Rate	POSITIVE	
% Teachers with B.A. Degree Only	NEGATIVE	
% Participating in Advanced Placement Programs	POSITIVE	(positive)
% Participating in Gifted/Talented Programs	POSITIVE	
Parent/Teacher Conference Attendance		POSITIVE

For a definition of positive and negative, see note on *Table 3.*

Table 7. *Direction of significant relationships between various school characteristics and the percentage of students competent in writing trait areas of Grade 9 Statewide Writing Examination*

Characteristics	Grade 9 Voice	Grade 9 Organiza-tion	Grade 9 Ideas	Grade 9 Conven-tion
% in Advanced Placement	(positive)	POSITIVE	POSITIVE	POSITIVE
% Gifted/Talented Ed.		POSITIVE	(positive)	POSITIVE
Per Pupil Expenditure for Instruction		POSITIVE		POSITIVE
Attendance Rate		POSITIVE		POSITIVE
Parent/Teacher Conference Attend.		POSITIVE		(positive)

For a definition of positive and negative, see note on *Table 3.*

As in the previous tables, the directions of partial correlations are listed in parentheses for certain school characteristics that slightly missed reaching a statistically significant level ($p > .05$, but $< .10$), but only if they were related to other student achievement data in the other analyses in that section (e.g, the other writing traits on a grade-level Statewide Writing Examination).

In the Reading section of grade 9 CTBS/4, performance **increased** with increases in the schools' attendance rates and increases in the percentage of students in advanced placement and gifted/talented programs. Reading performance **decreased** with increases in the percentage of students in English as a Second Language programs and increases in the percentage of teachers with a baccalaureate degree only in schools.

Few reliable findings emerged for the Mathematics section of grade 9 CTBS/4. Performance **increased** with increases in the percentage of students whose parents attended the schools' first parent/teacher conferences and increases in the percentage of students in advanced placement programs.

For the Writing Examination at the ninth grade, there were fewer school characteristics that were related to multiple writing trait categories than was the case for the sixth grade results. Performance **increased** in all ninth grade writing traits (voice, organization, ideas, and conventions) with increases in the schools' percentage of students in advance placement programs. Performance in organization, ideas, and conventions **increased** with increases in the schools' percentage of students in gifted/talented programs. Performance in organization and conventions **increased** with increases in per pupil expenditure for instructions, increases in attendance rates, and increases in the percent of students whose parents attended the schools' first parent/teacher conferences.

Implications

The "school characteristics" reviewed in the analyses' discussion can be considered as falling into two types: those that are characteristics primarily of schools and those that reflect an interaction of student/family characteristics and school characteristics. The findings for the relationship between primarily school characteristics and student achievement are mixed in the present school-level analyses. One school-based variable that had a positive relationship on grade three students and on reading in grade nine was **teachers with degrees higher than a baccalaureate**. This variable also had a positive relationship with on grade nine writing achievement, although the relationship was not significant due to the small number of schools compared. To the extent that this variable is important to student achievement, schools should encourage teachers to continue their own educational attainments. Also, teachers who have taught for **10 years and beyond** appeared to be related to improved reading at grade three, but the relationship was

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

inconsistent on other achievement results.

On the other hand, a school's **change in total enrollment** did not appear to have a consistent relationship with student achievement in these school-level analyses. Related school-based factors such as **teacher/student ratios** in the third and sixth grade and the secondary schools' **average class sizes in appropriate academic core areas** showed little relation to improved student achievement results. Indeed, higher sixth grade teacher/student ratios were accompanied by slightly higher achievement on sixth grade achievement variables. These class size variables didn't have a consistent impact on other achievement variables.

Other primarily school-based variables demonstrated mixed relationships with student achievement results. For example, higher **per pupil expenditure for instruction** had the expected positive relation with writing achievement at both the sixth and ninth grade and an expected, though not significant due to comparing too few schools, relation with grade nine reading. However, the variable had a negative relationship with grade 3 CTBS achievement. Also, high **total enrollment** at schools was negatively related to sixth grade student achievement in reading and in various writing skill characteristics, but seemed to be slightly positive with achievement on third grade mathematics. The higher the **percentage of elementary teachers teaching within license** showed the traditional positive relationship with grade six writing, but lower percentages were related to slightly higher grade three CTBS achievement in math and language.

Given the considerations discussed in the analyses section on provisional licensure, increases in spending at low-achieving schools, and the impact of a few rural schools on elementary teachers teaching within license, it will be interesting to see if the mixed results for some of these school characteristics will continue in next year's report.

A number of variables that have fairly consistent relationship with student achievement in this study are student/family variables that often interact with school programs. A predominant factor on CTBS results studied at the elementary-level was a gauge of the **socioeconomic status** of the family: the percentage of students participating in free/reduced lunch programs. Although there is little that schools' can do directly to influence existing families' socioeconomic status, targeted in-school programs to influence the achievement of special populations would be helpful. Further, efforts at pre-school programs directed at affecting the influence of socioeconomic factors on school readiness could prove useful to these students. Other readiness pre-school programs for preparing **English as a second language** students for elementary school would probably assist such students' academic achievement, especially in reading. Both pre-school suggestions are consistent with recommendations made to the Nevada Legislative Education Subcommittee in

March, 1994, and are based on previous research findings concerning the strong impact socioeconomic and ESL factors have on second grade achievement in Nevada's schools.

It is not clear how schools can address important student variables of high **transiency rates** and high percentages of **migrant education** students that appear to hamper student achievement in elementary schools. Likewise, high percentages of students in **gifted/talented** and **advanced placement** programs may simply reflect a large number of advanced students enrolled in certain schools. However, schools that do not have such programs, or do not adequately promote such programs, must become active in providing such educational services to their students. Also, programs that schools can institute to improve relevant student and family factors, such as **attendance rates** and fostering attendance at **parent/teacher conferences**, and other parental involvement should be helpful in improving student achievement.

Report Summary

In the first year of statewide school accountability in Nevada, a number of representatives from Nevada's educational, legislative, parental, and media groups met to establish reporting parameters consistent with the Nevada School Accountability Law, NRS 385.347. The only notable changes from the law that these groups recommended involved the law's requirement of reporting pupil/teacher ratios for each grade and graduation rates for high schools. The recommendation was made that pupil/teacher ratios be listed for grades kindergarten through six and that class sizes in core curriculum areas be reported in the secondary grades of seven through 12. Since there are complications with the use of graduation rates, especially the high school graduation rates of previous ninth graders, the group recommended the use of annual high school dropout rates.

The efforts of such advisory groups were very helpful in establishing guidelines for school accountability. However, the principal credit for comprehensively informing the public on school goals and characteristics goes to Nevada's school districts. The financing and staff efforts of each district in developing the information and designing and distributing the reports in a short period of time in the pilot year was impressive. The school reports were of high quality and were provided in a timely fashion. Consideration should be given to providing state funding to assist school districts with the financial impact of providing the reports to the public. Any annual state costs would be lessened by providing funds for the state to develop a computerized system for standardizing calculation of information and generating school reports.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

The school districts appeared to extend every effort toward providing information required by the law, as well as other data about each of their schools. In some cases, the amount of data resembled a research data file and was likely to diminish the impact of the information on most parents. This seems especially to be the case with reporting, for each grade, multiple student achievement scores, advancement scores, and attendance scores. Districts that reported CTBS/4 scores and percentages in the top and bottom quartile over a number of years for each grade at a school provided an impressive amount of information that was probably staggering to most parents and the public. Restricting such information to the state-mandated grades would be a worthwhile consideration as a revision in the accountability law. Likewise, advancement at most schools was fairly consistent in grades beyond first grade and may not need to be reported for all grades.

Analysis of the student academic performance data reported suggested that pre-school readiness programs to assist low socioeconomic students and students with English as a second language students could help improve performance. School programs that promote gifted and talented students, student attendance rates, and parental involvement would assist improved performance. Teacher experience over time and teachers' pursuit of increasing their own educational attainments also appear to be important.

At this point in the pilot year of school accountability, it isn't possible to assess how school districts will make use of the information collected to improve the performance of various schools. The effectiveness reports generated by the school districts (see educational scholars' review in *Appendix B*) were submitted very shortly after the production of the school and district reports. It will be interesting to review school districts' follow-up in effectiveness reports over the next few years. Clearly, the State Department's efforts in support of school improvement programs should look at school accountability findings at the various schools to identify areas for improvement in school characteristics and student performance.

Appendix A

CHAPTER 644

30

AN ACT relating to education; revising the provision concerning the program of accountability for public schools; and providing other matters properly relating thereto.

[Approved July 13, 1993]

THE PEOPLE OF THE STATE OF NEVADA, REPRESENTED IN SENATE AND ASSEMBLY, DO ENACT AS FOLLOWS:

Section 1. NRS 385.347 is hereby amended to read as follows:

385.347 1. The board of trustees of each school district in this state, in cooperation with associations recognized by the state board as representing licensed personnel in education in the district, shall adopt a program providing for the accountability of the school district to the residents of the district *and to the state board* for the quality of the schools and the educational achievement of the pupils in the district.

2. The board of trustees of each school district [may design its own program or may adopt the program developed by the Northwest Association of Schools and Colleges.

3. The program must require the board of trustees of the school district to report not less than annually] *must report during March of each year* to the residents of the district concerning:

(a) The educational goals and objectives of the school district;

(b) A comparison of pupil achievement *for each school in the district and the district as a whole* at each age and grade level for the current school year with that of previous school years;

(c) The ratio of pupils to teachers at each grade level *for each school in the district and the district as a whole* and other data concerning licensed and unlicensed employees of the school district;

(d) A comparison of the types of classes that each teacher has been assigned to teach with the qualifications and licensure of the teacher [;] *, for each school in the district and the district as a whole;*

(e) The total expenditure per pupil, set forth individually for each source of funding [;] *, for each school in the district and the district as a whole;*

(f) The curriculum used by the school district, including any special programs for pupils [;] *at an individual school;*

(g) Records of the attendance and advancement of pupils in all grades, *for each school in the district and the district as a whole,* and of graduation rates for pupils in *each* high school [; and] *in the district;*

(h) Efforts made by the school district *and by each school in the district* to increase communication with the parents of pupils in the district [.] *; and*

(i) Such other information as is directed by the superintendent of public instruction.

3. The superintendent of public instruction shall:

(a) Prescribe forms for the reports required pursuant to subsection 2 and provide the forms to the respective school districts.

(b) Provide statistical information and technical assistance to the school districts to ensure that the reports provide comparable information with respect to each school in each district and among the districts.

(c) Consult with a representative of:

(1) The Nevada State Education Association;

(2) The Nevada Association of School Boards;

(3) The Nevada Association of School Administrators; and

(4) The Nevada Parent Teachers Association,

concerning the program and consider any advice or recommendations submitted by the representatives with respect to the program.

4. On or before April 15 of each year, the board of trustees of each school district shall submit to the state board the report made pursuant to subsection 2. On or before June 15 of each year, the board of trustees of each school district shall submit to the state board:

(a) A separate report summarizing the effectiveness of the district's program of accountability during the school year; and

(b) A description of the efforts the district has made to correct deficiencies identified in the report submitted pursuant to paragraph (a).

5. On or before February 1 of each year, the superintendent of public instruction shall analyze the information submitted to the state board and report to the legislature concerning the effectiveness of the programs of accountability adopted pursuant to this section. In even-numbered years, the report must be submitted to the legislative commission.

Sec. 2. This act becomes effective on July 1, 1993, and expires by limitation on July 1, 1997.

Appendix B

A Report to the Superintendent of Public Instruction

Nevada Department of Education

November 1994

Program of Accountability of School Districts

Review and Analysis

Prepared by: The Panel of Scholars

University of Nevada, Reno and Las Vegas

Participants: Dr. Dale Anderson, Dean, College of Education, UNLV
Dr. Kevin Crehan, Associate Professor, UNLV
Dr. Gus Hill, Associate Professor, UNR
Dr. Eun Sook Hong, Assistant Professor, UNLV
Dr. Paul Jones, Professor, UNLV
Dr. David Noonan, Associate Professor, UNR
Dr. Philip Riner, Assistant Professor, UNLV
Dr. Marlowe Smaby, Professor/Chair, UNR

Participants/ Editors: Dr. Carolyn Chapman, Associate Professor, UNR
Dr. Myrna Matranga, Professor/Chair, UNR

Department of Education Representatives:
Dr. Kevin Crowe, Director, Planning, Research and Evaluation
Dr. David Smith, Consultant, Planning, Research and Evaluation

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Introduction 1

Narrative 2

Summary of Evaluations of Accountability Findings 3

Review of the Nevada Accountability Process 9

General Recommendations for Improving the Accountability Process 12

Technical Recommendations 13

Procedural Recommendations 14

Appendices

S.B. 511 . . . . . A

Letter to Eugene Paslov from the Office of the Attorney General regarding NRS 385.347 . . . . . B

Information for Completion of Report on Effectiveness of Accountability Program C

INTRODUCTION

During the 1993 session, the Nevada State Legislature passed into law S.B. 511 which revised the previous law concerning the program of accountability for public schools in the state. The bill added the State Board of Education as an entity to which reports are to be provided and expanded certain provisions of the law. These included by school and by district reporting of indicators: a) Educational Goals and Objectives, b) A comparison of pupil achievement, c) The ratio of pupils to teachers at each grade level, d) A comparison of the types of classes that each teacher has been assigned to teach with the qualifications and licensure of the teacher, e) The total expenditure per pupil, f) The curriculum, g) Records of the attendance and advancement of pupils in all grades, h) Efforts made to increase communication with the parents of pupils.

In addition to the above, S.B. 511 added a section which expanded the role and related powers of the Superintendent of Public Instruction by granting the superintendent the authority to require other information and to prescribe forms and processes related to data gathering and reporting. Further, it required that a separate report be submitted to the State Board of Education which summarized the effectiveness of districts' programs of accountability during the school year and described the efforts that districts made to correct deficiencies identified in the report.

Finally, the bill required that the Superintendent of Public Instruction analyze information provided by districts concerning the effectiveness of the programs of accountability and submit a report to the legislature or the legislative commission. The report which follows is intended to address the requirement of the law for analysis of information concerning the effectiveness of the programs.

In order to assist in this process an independent Panel of Scholars comprised of 10 professors from the University of Nevada, Las Vegas and Reno was convened for the purpose of review and analyses. Panel members read all of the summary reports submitted by districts and developed matrices to assist in the analysis. Subgroups of panel members were assigned school districts for closer review and later submitted reports to the panel as a whole. The panel as a whole reached consensus on all summary findings presented in this report. Categories for reporting include 1) A Summary of Evaluations of Nevada School District Accountability Findings, 2) A Review of the Nevada Accountability Process, 3) General Recommendations for Improving the Accountability Process, 4) Technical Recommendations, and 5) Procedural Recommendations. The appendices of this report include a copy of S.B. 511, an opinion from the Office of the Attorney General and instructions provided by the State Department of Education to school districts to clarify the requirements of the law specifically related to a separate report summarizing the effectiveness of the accountability program overall and efforts made to correct deficiencies identified.

SUMMARY OF EVALUATIONS OF ACCOUNTABILITY FINDINGS

NARRATIVE

The matrix that follows lists each Nevada school district and describes in an abbreviated form, the district's compliance with Section I. Subsection 4 of the law requiring that a separate report summarizing the effectiveness of the district's program of accountability during the school year; and a description of the efforts the district has made to correct deficiencies identified in the report.

In order to complete the analysis of data, the panel of scholars developed a by-district matrix including reference to 1) exemplary sites/areas of exemplary performance, 2) areas for improvement, 3) plans for correlating deficiencies, and 4) data consistency. Data consistency was examined in order to determine if there were relationships between areas in need of improvement as supported by data and plans for correcting noted deficiencies. Using the categories referred to above, the panel found 14 districts complied with all or portions of the law related to Section 1.4. Esmeralda, Pershing and White Pine Counties did not respond to any of the requirements under Subsection 4.

Of the remaining districts, Douglas and Eureka Counties did not identify areas in need of improvement in their reports. Plans for correcting deficiencies were not provided by Eureka, Humboldt and Storey County School Districts. Carson City, Churchill, Humboldt, Lander, Lyon, Nye, Storey and Washoe did not identify exemplary sites of exemplary areas of performance.

Clark, Elko, Lincoln and Mineral Counties complied with information requested under Subsection 4. As mentioned earlier, specific references to areas cited are included in the matrix summary.

SUMMARY OF EVALUATIONS OF ACCOUNTABILITY FINDINGS

School District	Exemplary sites, areas of exemplary performance	Areas for Improvement	Plans for Correcting Deficiencies	Data Consistency
Carson	None noted.	Districtwide: -Increased # of students scoring 3 or better on all traits at grade 8 -Improve math achievement through adherence and implementation of new math standards	--Increased staff development on analytical trait scoring and teaching --Increased teaching of writing using the trait method --Increased staff development in implementation of the new math standards Improved math instruction --School-by-school improvement goals	Goals not clearly related to test data.
Churchill	None cited in separate report. Some progress toward districtwide goals listed in accountability report.	Parent involvement at secondary level lower than at elementary.	--district-wide Student Registration Center (SRC) --stimulate higher level of parent interest, involvement at high school level --Increased use of technology	No apparent relationship between technology and needs identified in report. Goals not clearly related to test data.
Clark	The district identified exemplary schools which included reference to special programs, honors, or features which were primarily responsible for its selection as an exemplary school.	The district identified specific schools in need of improvement. The criteria for the selection of schools in need of improvement were not explicitly stated; interventions described suggest the reasons for selection.	The district has developed a series of goals with a narrative describing progress toward goal attainment. Information which would link schools in need of improvement and district goals was unclear.	Please refer to previous column.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

SUMMARY OF EVALUATIONS OF ACCOUNTABILITY FINDINGS

School District	Exemplary sites, areas of exemplary performance	Areas for Improvement	Plans for Correcting Deficiencies	Data Consistency
Douglas	1. All schools demonstrated "consistency" in nat'l %ile scores on the CTBS in grades 4, 6,& 9 --All elem. schools at grade 3 scored at or above the 58th %ile in reading, math & lang. --All elem. schools at grade 6 scored at or above the 53rd %ile in reading, math & lang. --All secondary schools scored at or above the 48th %ile in the core subject areas. 2. District continues to rely heavily on CRT's which measure basic skills directly aligned to grade level curriculum objectives. These provide instructional information and continuity. 3. College entrance scores continue to be above the state and nation while more students are taking the exams. 4. Nevada Analytic Writing Exams Grade 6 - at or above 75% Grade 9 - at or above 45% 5. Strategic Plan developed	No needs specified	1. Give CTBS at 4,8,9 as well as 3,6,9 2. Give CRT's in lang. and math up to grade 9. Pilot math CRT for grades 1-9 in 94-95. Begin CRT's for language arts for grades 7, 8, 9. 3. Enhance writing instruction in the elem. schools with use of district-wide lang arts portfolios in K-6 by 1995-96. 4. Implement '"district and site accountability for student achievement" with "measurable, observable competencies in all curriculum areas." (Note: 1-4 are all changes in measurement rather than changes in instruction.) 5. Community service learning experiences for students. -- Increase levels of parent education and involvement. (No plan for accomplishment)	No clear relationship between data and plans. Explanation needed for citing as evidence of exemplary secondary students scoring at the 48%ile in core subjects and having 45% of 6th grade students "pass" in writing.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

SUMMARY OF EVALUATIONS OF ACCOUNTABILITY FINDINGS

School District	Exemplary sites, areas of exemplary performance	Areas for Improvement	Plans for Correcting Deficiencies	Data Consistency
Elko	None cited. Progress: Since January 1993, sixty teachers have attended at least one workshop on analytic trait writing assessment.	"The performance level of student writing at the elementary grades as indicated by the analytic trait writing assessment must be increased."	--Continue to strengthen parental contacts and participation with the schools. Schools will continue efforts to promote parental participation and to provide pertinent information to parents. --Establish and implement a plan to increase teachers' knowledge of the analytic trait writing assessment, and direct writing assessment methods. --Beginning with the fall of 1994, revision of the English curriculum, student learning objectives and teacher training objectives on direct writing will be added to the districtwide curriculum.	Need for improving writing is supported by test data.
Esmeralda	The district did not provide a report which responded to Subsection 1.4 and the attendant guidelines published in the State Department Handbook for Accountability.	Information not reported.	The district has developed a series of goals.	Information not reported.
Eureka Clearly followed specifications for reporting.	Exemplary school site: Eureka Co. High School – 100% of graduates enrolled in post secondary education. --Increasing test scores. --Integrated Learning System for Chapter I students. --Juniors and seniors have opportunity to obtain college credit from NNCC.	"None identified at this time."	None identified.	

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

SUMMARY OF EVALUATIONS OF ACCOUNTABILITY FINDINGS

School District	Exemplary sites, areas of exemplary performance	Areas for Improvement	Plans for Correcting Deficiencies	Data Consistency
Humboldt	None noted	Six district-wide areas: --Counseling services at all schools --Provide gifted and talented programs in all schools --Provide for appropriate technology programs for all middle schools and high schools --Certified ESL teachers in each of our schools --Continued curriculum development to improve the education of all students --Expansion of alternative education and summer school programs	None noted (because of budget constraints)	Limited relationship between the six areas for improvement and the accountability data
Lander	None noted	Sixth grade writing	Teacher training opportunities for sixth grade writing	No data
Lincoln	The district identified strengths in its report by recognizing exemplary schools.	The district identified schools in need of improvement.	The district's goals were not specifically related to its stated deficiencies but referred in general to areas in need of improvement like CTBS scores in identified schools.	Consistency noted.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

SUMMARY OF EVALUATIONS OF ACCOUNTABILITY FINDINGS

School District	Exemplary sites, areas of exemplary performance	Areas for Improvement	Plans for Correcting Deficiencies	Data Consistency
Lyon	None noted	Math achievement Large number of special education students	--Increased intervention team activities through assistance of school psychologist and inservice of administrators and teachers --Development of their own testing program including CRT's and other alternative assessments.	Narrative statements of report were not entirely supported by the accountability data
Mineral	Hawthorne Middle School: Focus on academic performance, attendance, family advocate, promoting self esteem	Mineral High School Hawthorne Elementary Shurz Elementary	--Staff meeting to improve test scores --Focus on 5% gain in overall performance --Math committee to work on math curriculum for K-12 --Increase inservice for all staff --Provide all schools with parent link program to improve parental involvement	Data were not cited in Part 3, but plans were consistent with reports to parents
Nye	None noted	The district did not provide adequate information in order to determine areas in need of improvement at individual school sites.	The district goals were not directly related to the deficiencies noted in the report. There were no plans to address deficiencies at the site level.	Insufficient information provided.
Pershing	None noted	None noted	None noted	Report did not appear to address any of the requirements of the law.

SUMMARY OF EVALUATIONS OF ACCOUNTABILITY FINDINGS

School District	Exemplary sites, areas of exemplary performance	Areas for Improvement	Plans for Correcting Deficiencies	Data Consistency
Storey	None noted	Spelling	None noted	Narrative reports not related to the accountability data
Washoe	None noted	--Wide variation of counseling time provided to elementary schools --Concern with percentage of students scoring in the bottom quartile --Drop-out rates still too high	--Requested additional funds from legislature to increase number of counselors --Conduct workshops for principals and teachers to identify specific areas of weaknesses --Design specific instruction to correct deficiencies --Investigate measures designed to keep more students in high school	No achievement data cited in report.
White Pine	The district did not provide a report which responded to Subsection 1.4 and the attendant guidelines published in the State Department Handbook for Accountability	Information not reported	The district has developed a series of goals.	Information not reported

REVIEW OF THE NEVADA SCHOOL ACCOUNTABILITY PROCESS

School District	Areas where required information was not available	Plans to get information next year	Impact of providing accountability reports
Carson	Readily available	N/A	$9,600; 3 people; 1 month
Churchill	Some test information; parent involvement data	Will collect	Not specifically reported
Clark	- Data by grade level on class size and on teachers teaching outside their area of certification - Requirement to report all classes taught and schools where those classes are not taught produces confusing data where schools employ a variety of grade configurations.	- Recommend revision in Handbook for Accountability Reporting in regard to items previously cited.	Total cost for 1993-94 was $220,630. Anticipate future years' cost of $175,000 plus any inflationary costs. Clark County School District continues to support accountability efforts and commits to engage in continued productive support of the refinement of the specifications of the SB 511 program.
Douglas	All available except parent involvement	Will collect	$8,800; 2 months
Elko	- Average class size by subject area, by grade level 9-12 - % students participating in specific subjects - SAT data - Expenditures per student	- Should be deleted as requirement - Will collect Sample too small to be meaningful Misleading or meaningless in small districts	$2,500 material and postage Staff time estimated value at $13,757
Esmeralda	No separate report responding to Subsection 1.4 was submitted.	Not addressed	Not addressed
Eureka	All information available	Not applicable	$9,760; 45 people, 300 hours
Humboldt	Not addressed	Not addressed	Expressed concern about time and cost but provided no specific data
Lander	"Information was available but not readily accessible."	Not applicable	300 person hours. "Because of small size and lack of human resources a great deal of overtime was required increasing the cost of preparation."

REVIEW OF THE NEVADA SCHOOL ACCOUNTABILITY PROCESS

School District	Areas where required information was not available	Plans to get information next year	Impact of providing accountability reports
Lincoln	No separate report responding to Subsection 1.4 was submitted.	Not addressed	Not addressed
Lyon	Sixth and ninth grade writing exam results available only for the 1992-93 school year.	Will be included in future reports as it is collected.	- 5,000 copies printed for distribution. - Estimated hourly preparation cost: $25 75 hours of clerical time; 285 hours of administrative time. Total cost: $9,000 or $1.86 per student
Mineral	- Percentage of total enrollment participating in special programs was inadvertently left out. - Percentage of students whose parents attended formally scheduled parent-teacher conferences was not included.	These areas will be tracked and included in next year's report.	- 3,306 person hours - Total costs: $9,352.00
Nye	No separate report responding to Subsection 1.4 was submitted.	Not addressed	Not addressed
Pershing	No separate report responding to Subsection 1.4 provided. "All of the required information was provided in the schools' individual reports."	Not addressed	Not addressed
Storey	All information available	Not applicable	"Probably less than $250." [Direct cost] "Secretaries, counselors, teachers, and administrators spent several hours each. Superintendent spent a dozen hours." "Hundreds of man-power dollars were spent in completing the document."

REVIEW OF THE NEVADA SCHOOL ACCOUNTABILITY PROCESS

School District	Areas where required information was not available	Plans to get information next year	Impact of providing accountability reports
Washoe	Only a few required items of information were not available: Because of mixed grade levels in classes in middle schools and high schools, a. Average class sizes by grade and subject; b. Percentage of classes taught by teachers outside their license by grade level and subject; c. Results of sixth and ninth grade writing exam available for only 1992-93 school year and not for the two preceding years; d. Results of high school proficiency test by three areas for current and three preceding years e. School by school data on ACT and SAT available only for current year.	Data for "a" and "b" are unlikely to be available in future years. Recommend deleting this degree of detail. c. Each year's data will be reported as it becomes available. Procedures for gathering all required elements have been implemented for future reporting years, for both "d" and "e".	Accountability reports have been well received by the public. The initial press run of 250 district reports was exhausted within six weeks and a second printing was ordered. Feedback has been uniformly positive. During the last week in March, 1994, 42,000 elementary school reports were printed and distributed to parents through their children. 21,000 reports for middle and high schools were printed and mailed to parents. Copies were distributed to local media, realtors and the Economic Development Authority of Western Nevada.
White Pine	No separate report responding to Subsection 1.4 was submitted.		

GENERAL RECOMMENDATIONS FOR IMPROVING THE ACCOUNTABILITY PROCESS

The following general recommendations were made by school district leaders in response for the request for their input:

Agree on standards of achievement for each grade level, assess the attainment of those standards, and provide indicators of progress in student achievement over time. The accountability process should lead to better understanding of how district programs do or do not articulate through grade levels. (Carson, Lyon)

Achievement assessments done by the district should be completely aligned with the curriculum and instruction. Data should be incorporated into districts' planning processes. (Clark, Douglas)

Quality indicators should go beyond academic test scores and other more easily quantified indicators. (Rethink required test scores as indicators for achievement.) (Carson, Douglas, Elko, Lyon)

Agree on the indicators of a quality school climate (Carson, Lander)
Assess the attainment of those indicators and progress over time. (Carson, Lander)

The accountability program should enhance the instructional process. We need to agree on indicators of effective instruction and assess the quality of instruction. (Carson, Lander)

Derive ways to improve the quality of instruction and track the impact of the improvements (Carson)

The system should stress doing a few things well. Manage and streamline the data collection so as not to be buried by it--Keep it simple. One way to do this is to move toward a narrative style with fewer statistics. (Carson, Clark, Eureka, Lander, Storey)

Summarize and interpret the data effectively. (Carson, Elko, Lander, Lyon, Storey) Each section of statistical information should contain a narrative explanation of what the numbers mean. Common language should be considered. For example, the section on per pupil expenditures would be much more informative if some language were added to explain the five main categories included and why variations between schools exist. (Washoe)

REVIEW OF THE NEVADA SCHOOL ACCOUNTABILITY PROCESS

TECHNICAL RECOMMENDATIONS FOR IMPROVING THE ACCOUNTABILITY PROCESS

Delete requirement to report sources of revenue by school site (Elko)

The section on special programs needs both additions and deletions. At the elementary level, the items reporting the percentage served in music, physical education, art, and computers should be dropped. Since the State Course of Study requires instruction in all those areas, the percentages are all 100%. Further, it is not clear why they are considered "special" programs. Secondly, the high school reports could be improved by adding such programs as JROTC and alternative education as categories. (Washoe)

Reporting the percentage of parents who attended the first parent-teacher conference is not an accurate indicator of parent involvement. We are unaware of any statistical barometer to do so fairly. Instead, we propose that schools be required to list opportunities for parent involvement. (Washoe)

We question the usefulness of the data about the percentage of students promoted to the next grade. Most districts actively discourage the practice of retention except at first grade. It is not clear to us how this information is an indicator of quality. (Washoe)

The section reporting the percentage of elementary teachers teaching fully within their area of licensure should be deleted. All elementary teachers must be so licensed and all the percentages for our district were 100%. (Washoe)

As a new section, we recommend that high schools report the percentages moving on to post-secondary education including two-year, four-year, and other institutions. (Washoe)

In addition to the data about student-counselor ratios, we suggest that similar data for nurses and psychologists be added. Instead of comparing those data to a districtwide average, the ratio for elementary schools should be compared to the district elementary average, middle schools to their average and high schools to the high school average. (Washoe)

REVIEW OF THE NEVADA SCHOOL ACCOUNTABILITY PROCESS

PROCEDURAL RECOMMENDATIONS

State-generated software for reporting to guarantee all required information is reported and in the same format (Lander, Lincoln, Mineral)

Training opportunity on writing reports (Carson, Lander)

Provide financial support, especially to smaller districts that do not have the manpower of the larger districts in the state (Mineral, Nye, Storey)

Data utilization should be incorporated into districts' planning processes.

(REPRINTED WITH ADOPTED AMENDMENTS)
SECOND REPRINT S.B. 511

SENATE BILL NO. 511—COMMITTEE ON FINANCE

JUNE 1, 1993

Referred to Committee on Finance

SUMMARY—Revises provision concerning program of accountability for public schools. (BDR 34-2075)

FISCAL NOTE: Effect on Local Government: Yes.
Effect on the State or on Industrial Insurance: Contains Appropriation.

EXPLANATION—Matter in italics is new; matter in brackets [ ] is material to be omitted.

AN ACT relating to education; revising the provision concerning the program of accountability for public schools; and providing other matters properly relating thereto.

THE PEOPLE OF THE STATE OF NEVADA, REPRESENTED IN SENATE AND ASSEMBLY, DO ENACT AS FOLLOWS:

Section 1. NRS 385.347 is hereby amended to read as follows:

385.347 1. The board of trustees of each school district in this state, in cooperation with associations recognized by the state board as representing licensed personnel in education in the district, shall adopt a program providing for the accountability of the school district to the residents of the district *and to the state board* for the quality of the schools and the educational achievement of the pupils in the district.

2. The board of trustees of each school district [may design its own program or may adopt the program developed by the Northwest Association of Schools and Colleges.

3. The program must require the board of trustees of the school district to report not less than annually] *must report during March of each year* to the residents of the district concerning:

(a) The educational goals and objectives of the school district;

(b) A comparison of pupil achievement *for each school in the district and the district as a whole* at each age and grade level for the current school year with that of previous school years;

(c) The ratio of pupils to teachers at each grade level *for each school in the district and the district as a whole* and other data concerning licensed and unlicensed employees of the school district;

(d) A comparison of the types of classes that each teacher has been assigned to teach with the qualifications and licensure of the teacher [;] , *for each school in the district and the district as a whole;*

(e) The [average] number [per pupil, for the industry for each unit of

(f) The curriculum used by the school district, including any special programs for pupils [;] *at an individual school;*

(g) Records of the attendance and advancement of pupils in all grades, *for each school in the district and the district as a whole,* and of graduation rates for pupils in *each* high school [; and] *in the district;*

(h) Efforts made by the school district *and by each school in the district* to increase communication with the parents of pupils in the district [.] *; and*

(i) Such other information as is directed by the superintendent of public instruction.

3. The superintendent of public instruction shall:

(a) Prescribe forms for the reports required pursuant to subsection 2 and provide the forms to the respective school districts.

(b) Provide statistical information and technical assistance to the school districts to ensure that the reports provide comparable information with respect to each school in each district and among the districts.

(c) Consult with a representative of:

(1) The Nevada State Education Association;

(2) The Nevada Association of School Boards;

(3) The Nevada Association of School Administrators; and

(4) The Nevada Parent Teachers Association,

concerning the program and consider any advice or recommendations submitted by the representatives with respect to the program.

4. On or before April 15 of each year, the board of trustees of each school district shall submit to the state board the report made pursuant to subsection 2. On or before June 15 of each year, the board of trustees of each school district shall submit to the state board:

(a) A separate report summarizing the effectiveness of the district's program of accountability during the school year; and

(b) A description of the efforts the district has made to correct deficiencies identified in the report submitted pursuant to paragraph (a).

5. On or before February 1 of each year, the superintendent of public instruction shall analyze the information submitted to the state board and report to the legislature concerning the effectiveness of the programs of accountability adopted pursuant to this section. In even-numbered years, the report must be submitted to the legislative commission.

Sec. 2. This act becomes effective on July 1, 1993, and expires by limitation on July 1, 1997.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

STATE OF NEVADA
OFFICE OF THE ATTORNEY GENERAL
Capitol Complex
Carson City, Nevada 89710
Telephone (702) 687-4170
Fax (702) 687-5798

FRANKIE SUE DEL PAPA
Attorney General

BROOKE A. NIELSEN
Assistant Attorney General

November 15, 1993

Eugene T. Paslov, Ph.D.
Superintendent of Public Instruction
Department of Education
400 West King Street
Carson City, Nevada 89710

Dear Dr. Paslov:

You have asked this office for an opinion regarding NRS 385.347, as amended by Act of June 1, 1993, ch. 644, § 1, 1992 Nev. Stat. 2745 ("Senate Bill 511"). A difference of opinion was raised in a discussion between your office and local school district superintendents. One school district has interpreted this section to mean that the district must describe efforts to correct deficiencies in its system of accountability, not efforts to correct deficiencies that have been identified at the school sites. The interpretation will affect the type of information included in the report to the legislature and will impact local school districts' planning for compliance with the reporting requirement.

QUESTION

Is it the meaning of NRS 385.347(4) that each district shall identify deficiencies and describe efforts to correct deficiencies:

1) In the system of accountability reporting; or

2) At the school sites, based upon an analysis and interpretation of the data reported under this statute?

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

ANALYSIS

NRS 385.347, sometimes known as the school accountability law, was first adopted by our legislature in 1989. Each of the 17 school districts reported district-wide data or information to the parents and community it served and to the State Superintendent of Public Instruction pursuant to the law. In the 1993 session of the legislature, the law was amended to provide refinements and to specify that the data or information shall be reported for each school in the district rather than for the district as a whole.

Subsection (4) of NRS 385.347, as amended by Senate Bill 511, provides that:

> 4. On or before April 15 of each year, the board of trustees of each school district shall submit to the state board the report made pursuant to subsection 2. On or before June 15 of each year, the board of trustees of each school district shall submit to the state board:
>
> (a) A separate report summarizing the effectiveness of the district's program of accountability during the school year; and
>
> (b) A description of the efforts the district has made to correct deficiencies identified in the report submitted pursuant to paragraph (a). [Emphasis added.]

If the language of the statute is plain and unambiguous, there is no room for construction. *Atlantic Commercial Dev. Corp. v. Boyles*, 103 Nev. 35, 38, 732 P.2d 1360 (1987). An examination of the language of the law begins with subsection (4)(a) which calls for a report of the effectiveness of the school district's "program of accountability." The key to our analysis is the description of "program of accountability" found in subsection 1 of NRS 385.347, as amended by Senate Bill 511. It states that the board of trustees shall "adopt a program providing for the accountability of the school district . . . for the quality of the schools and the educational achievement of the pupils in the district." *Id.* From the description we glean that the program of accountability is not merely the methodology for gathering and reporting the data. The deficiencies identified in the report will be deficiencies in the "quality of the schools and the educational achievement of the pupils in the district." *Id.* The effectiveness of the program would be how it affects the quality of the schools and the educational achievement of the pupils. In addition, whether the information or data constitutes a deficiency is a determination to be made by the local trustees from the data or information gathered pursuant to the law.

CONCLUSION

NRS 385.347, as amended by Senate Bill 511, requires that each school district identify deficiencies and describe efforts to correct deficiencies in the quality of schools and the educational achievement of pupils at school sites based upon the analysis and interpretation of the data reported pursuant to this statute.

Cordially,

FRANKIE SUE DEL PAPA
Attorney General

By: Melanie Meehan Crossley
MELANIE MEEHAN CROSSLEY
Deputy Attorney General
Government Affairs
(702) 687-3514

MMC:jf

Part 3
Information for Completion of
REPORT ON EFFECTIVENESS OF ACCOUNTABILITY PROGRAM

The Nevada School Accountability Law requires that the Board of Trustees of school districts provide a separate report covering the effectiveness of the district's program of accountability and a description of the efforts the district has made to correct deficiencies identified in the reports specified in Parts 1 and 2 of the Handbook. **Five copies** of this report should be submitted to the Nevada Department of Education on or before June 15 of each year.

This section provides a general description of the contents of the School District's Effectiveness Report. The report can be considered in terms of two major themes: the Evaluation Process itself, and the Evaluation Findings. Each are reviewed below.

Review of the Accountability Process

The review of the accountability process should contain, but not be restricted to, the following elements:

a. areas where <u>required</u> (not the elective) information was not available from the previous school year for the present reports;

b. plans for providing the required, but presently missing, information in the reports provided to the public in the next year;

c. the impact on the school district of providing the public with the school accountability reports (use the District Impact Survey); and

d. recommendations for improving the accountability process at the state-, district-, and school-level.

Evaluation of Accountability Findings

The evaluation of accountability findings should contain, but not be restricted to, the following elements:

a. identification of exemplary school sites;

b. a review of the evidence indicating the areas of exemplary performance at those school sites;

c. any model programs or activities at those school sites believed to be responsible for the areas of exemplary performance at those sites;

d. an indication of school sites where areas for improvement were identified;

e. a review of the evidence for any deficiencies identified and discussion of the areas for improvement at each of these sites;

f. district efforts to impact those areas for improvement at each identified school site; and

g. any district-wide areas for improvement, along with the evidence for those deficiencies, and any efforts in the future to secure the improvement desired.

Appendix C

Table C1 – DISTRICTS' SCHOOL CHARACTERISTICS

SCHOOL DISTRICT	ENROLL	ENROLL CHANGE	TRANS'Y RATE	ATTEND RATE	COUNSEL /STUDNT	PAR'NT/T'CHR CONFERENCE ATTENDANCE	PER PUPIL EXPENDITURE INSTRUCTION	PER PUPIL EXPENDITURE ADMINISTRAT'N	PER PUPIL EXPENDITURE OPERATIONS
CARSON CITY GR. K-6 GR. 7-12	6,753	 1.0% 5.9%	 29.4% 22.4%	 94.4% 92.4%	 635 400	N.R.	N.R.	N.R.	N.R.
CHURCHILL	3,889	4.5%	18.5%	95.5%	648	52.3%	$2829	$ 468	$ 463
CLARK	136,169	5.4%	31.7%	92.2%	608	N.R.	$2740	$ 603	$ 466
DOUGLAS	6,285	8.5%	18.6%	93.5%	484	N.R.	$2901	$ 481	$ 488
ELKO	8,710	5.5%	23.1%	92.8%	484	N.R.	$2912	$ 469	$1147
ESMERALDA	143	-3.4%	33.3%	92.5%	477	95.0%	N.R.	N.R.	N.R.
EUREKA	317	6.0%	24.6%	95.1%	317	N.R.	$6246*	$2215*	$1814*
HUMBOLDT	3,369	6.7%	22.6%	93.4%	N.R.	N.R.	$3219	$ 498	$ 537
LANDER	1,563	0.0%	24.5%	94.4%	520	N.R.	$3527	$ 560	$ 836
LINCOLN	1,097	-1.6%	20.7%	94.5%	330	72.0%	$4201	$ 582	$441
LYON	4,541	4.6%	22.9%	92.9%	395	69.3%	$2871	$ 648	$672
MINERAL	1,187	6.2%	18.0%	92.6%	275	N.R.	$2709	$ 748	$578
NYE ELEMENTARY HIGH SCHOOL	3,621	 3.2% 10.5%	 26.2% 23.7%	 92.7% 92.1%	N.R.	N.R.	N.R.	N.R.	N.R.
PERSHING	862	4.9%	22.1%	91.9%	431	81.8% (K-8)	$3490	$ 660	$694
STOREY	448	6.7%	19.8%	94.5%	448	70.8%*	$3804	$1531	$776
WASHOE	41,817	5.1%	40.0%	94.0%	461	N.R.	$2691	$438	$437
WHITE PINE	1,678	7.6%	18.1%	93.4%	573	N.R.	$3063	$759	$575

* Computed from data from different schools.

Table C2 -- CLASSROOMS IN DISTRICTS

SCHOOL DISTRICT	CLASS SIZE-K	CLASS SIZE G.1	CLASS SIZE G.2	CLASS SIZE G.3	CLASS SIZE G.4	CLASS SIZE G.5	CLASS SIZE G.6	% T'CHRS IN LICENSE	% T'CHRS W/ B.A. ONLY	TCH.EXPER 10YRS.+
CARSON CITY	23	14	14	26	26	28	27	95.5%	73.0%	48.0%
CHURCHILL	19	15	16	22	22	26	25	100.0%	88.5%	37.5%
CLARK	24	16	16	27	28	29	25	100.0%	46.0%	38.0%
DOUGLAS	24	16	15	27	26	26	26	96.4%	67.3%	38.0%
ELKO	18	16	16	26	26	25	26	99.8%	84.6%	41.2%
ESMERALDA	10	11	15	15	18	20	15	78.6%	85.7%	35.7%
EUREKA	9.5*	11.5*	11.5*	12.5*	15*	19*	12*	83.9%	87.1%	22.6%
HUMBOLDT	23	16	16	22	23	24	N.R.	99.6%	85.0%	35.0%
LANDER	17	15	14	20	17	19	N.R.	95.0%	79.0%	35.0%
LINCOLN	13	11	13	13	16	18	21	95.4%	53.0%	52.0%
LYON	19	15	17	21	23	25	27	97.8%	81.8%	47.4%
MINERAL	29	16	16	18	20	19	32	100%	76.4%	75.0%
NYE	15	12	15	21	22	22	20	94.7%	76.0%	51.8%
PERSHING	N.R.	N.R.	N.R.	N.R.	N.R.	N.R.	N.R.	96.4%	89.0%	55.7%
STOREY	8	13	13	16	18	25	18	85.0%	74.0%	50.0%
WASHOE	24	16	16	25	27	26	27	98.7%*	51.0%	38.0%
WHITE PINE	14	12	16	19	28	27	18	97.2%	85.2%	52.8%

* Computed from data from different schools.

Table C2 – CLASSROOMS IN DISTRICTS (CONT.)

SCHOOL DISTRICT	SECOND. ENGLISH CL. SIZE	SECOND. MATH CL. SIZE	SECOND. SCIENCE CL. SIZE	SECOND SOC.SCI CL. SIZE	SEC.ENG. TAUGHT OUT LIC.	SEC.M'TH TAUGHT OUT LIC.	SEC.SCI. TAUGHT OUT LIC.	SEC.SOC. SCI.OUT LIC.
CARSON CITY	27.3*	25.8*	26.1*	21.1*	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.6%
CHURCHILL	24.6	23.7	23.2	28.2	0.0%	0.0%	1.0%	0.0%
CLARK	26.0	26.9	27.5	27.5	0.8%	1.0%	0.6%	0.2%
DOUGLAS	23.5*	23.4*	22.3*	23.2*	0.9%	0.9%	5.0%	2.9%
ELKO	21.6*	21.0*	22.7*	24.6*	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
ESMERALDA	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----
EUREKA	15.3*	10.8*	9.7*	20.4*	1 class	0.0%	0.0%	1 class
HUMBOLDT	20.9*	20.3*	20.5*	20.7*	N.R.	N.R.	N.R.	N.R.
LANDER	19.9	18.3	18.3	19.2	N.R.	0.0%	N.R.	0.0%
LINCOLN	18.7*	11.9*	12.5*	19.2*	N.R.	N.R.	N.R.	N.R.
LYON	20.8*	20.8*	21.3*	19.6*	0.0%	0.0%	2.4%*	0.0%
MINERAL	23.7*	21.3*	21.0*	24.4*	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
NYE	18.3*	13.9*	15.0*	17.2*	2.0%*	2.2%*	0.0%	0.0%
PERSHING	25.0	24.0	23.2	23.1	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
STOREY	16.9*	18.3*	16.1*	18.1*	13.3%**	37.7%**	0.0%	14.3%**
WASHOE	25.7	26.7**	26.8**	26.9**	2.0%	0.5%	0.4%	3.0%
WHITE PINE	N.R.	N.R.	N.R.	N.R.	N.R.	N.R.	N.R.	N.R.

* Calculated from average of individual grade figures.
** Computed from data from different schools.

Table C3 – DISTRICT ELEMENTARY STUDENT PERFORMANCE

	NATIONAL PERCENTILE RANK OF AVE.SCORE						PERCENT OF 6TH GRADERS COMPETENT			
SCHOOL DISTRICT	READ GR.3	MATH GR.3	LANG GR.3	READ GR.6	MATH GR.6	LANG GR.6	WRITING IDEAS	WRITING ORGANIZ.	WRITING VOICE	WRITING CONVENT'N
CARSON CITY	44%	39%	38%	48%	45%	49%	62.7%	57.8%	70.1%	63.1%
CHURCHILL	62%	49%	50%	61%	55%	58%	N.R.	N.R.	N.R.	N.R.
CLARK	57%	61%	54%	53%	63%	54%	54.7%	50.4%	61.0%	58.2%
DOUGLAS	63%	66%	63%	60%	69%	61%	60.0%	56.0%	69.0%	62.0%
ELKO	57%	53%	53%	58%	53%	56%	58.9%	56.1%	66.0%	61.9%
ESMERALDA	43%	58%	47%	43%	50%	43%	30.0%	30.0%	10.0%	10.0%
EUREKA (EUREKA ELEM. SCHOOL ONLY)	66%	61%	54%	46%	71%	61%	N.R.	N.R.	N.R.	N.R.
HUMBOLDT	59%	59%	57%	47%	45%	46%	51.8%	48.6%	61.5%	58.4%
LANDER	61%	59%	58%	54%	70%	63%	47.9%	48.7%	47.9%	60.5%
LINCOLN	57%	62%	50%	54%	51%	53%	53.0%	63.0%	63.0%	62.0%
LYON	54%	49%	48%	51%	49%	50%	58.9%	54.9%	67.7%	57.4%
MINERAL	51%	37%	28%	39%	36%	42%	41.7%	37.9%	58.9%	40.8%
NYE	41%	45%	41%	42%	41%	47%	N.R.	N.R.	N.R.	N.R.
PERSHING	52%	37%	45%	41%	48%	43%	53.3%	51.7%	53.3%	60.0%
STOREY	N.R.	N.R.	N.R.	N.R.	N.R.	N.R.	N.R.	N.R.	N.R.	N.R.
WASHOE	58%	61%	58%	59%	63%	60%	60.8%	56.1%	60.8%	60.8%
WHITE PINE	64%	49%	59%	62%	48%	55%	58.4%	48.2%	56.5%	69.9%

Table C4 -- DISTRICT SECONDARY STUDENT PERFORMANCE

	AVE. %TILE		% OF 9TH GRADERS COMPETENT					% SENIORS PASSING							
SCHOOL DISTRICT	READ GR.9	MATH GR.9	WRITE IDEAS	WRITE ORGAN.	WRITE VOICE	WRITE CONVEN -TION	DROP OUT RATE	READ PROFI CIENT	MATH PROFI CIENT	WRITE PROFI CIENT	% SR'S TAKING ACT	ACT AVE	% SR'S TAKING SAT	SAT VER- BAL	SAT MATH
CARSON CITY	55%	51%	70.1%	67.6%	81.9%	80.7%	5.5%	88.4%	86.7%	96.1%	51%	21.0	46%	416	472
CHURCHILL	N.R.	N.R.	68.6%	62.8%	68.6%	70.8%	6.7%	98.4%	97.9%	98.4%	53%	21.6	24%	431	478
CLARK	56%	59%	68.0%	65.0%	79.7%	73.1%	9.6%	96.0%	96.5%	97.2%	43%	21.1	27%	430	495
DOUGLAS	55%	61%	77.0%	75.0%	84.0%	80.0%	4.6%	99.3%	98.6%	99.6%	N.R.	21.8	N.R.	449	505
ELKO	60%	67%	70.2%	67.1%	82.4%	77.6%	6.0%	97.5%	97.0%	98.2%	43%	21.0	0%	----	----
ESMERALDA	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----
EUREKA	68%	56%	74.0%	74.0%	90.0%	90.0%	2.2%	100%	100%	100%	63%	21.9	69%	392	435
HUMBOLDT	51%	48%	63.9%	61.1%	85.1%	78.4%	3.8%	98.0%	99.3%	100%	55%	20.6	28%	428	468
LANDER	51%	61%	72.7%	74.4%	87.6%	81.0%	6.9%	100%	100%	100%	54%	20.0	20%	270	310
LINCOLN	58%	56%	68.0%	68.0%	75.0%	83.0%	0.2%	100%	100%	100%	60%	21.1	N.R.	N.R.	N.R.
LYON	54%	47%	69.5%	65.9%	80.3%	74.1%	8.7%	94.3%	93.9%	98.3%	43%	21.5	19%	459	496
MINERAL	49%	44%	22.7%	20.2%	27.8%	18.0%	9.4%	92.0%	93.0%	97.0%	N.R.	N.R.	N.R.	N.R.	N.R.
NYE	49%	48%	N.R.	N.R.	N.R.	N.R.	5.2%	100%	100%	100%	41%	19.0	12%	414	435
PERSHING	48%	42%	N.R.	N.R.	N.R.	N.R.	3.1%	100%	100%	100%	81%	19.1	22%	471	521
STOREY	51%	51%	N.R.	N.R.	N.R.	N.R.	8.3%	100%	100%	100%	37%	18.5	N.R.	N.R.	N.R.
WASHOE	60%	60%	71.0%	67.8%	81.7%	75.4%	6.6%	98.0%	97.0%	99.0%	35%	21.3	26%	444	491
WHITE PINE	61%	46%	N.R.	N.R.	N.R.	N.R.	5.9%	N.R.	N.R.	N.R.	N.R.	N.R.	N.R.	N.R.	N.R.

Table C5 – ELEMENTARY SCHOOL CHARACTERISTICS

CARSON

SCHOOL	ENROLL	ENROLL CHANGE	TRANS'Y RATE	ATTEND RATE	COUNSEL /STUDNT	PAR'NT/T'CHR CONFERENCE ATTENDANCE	PER PUPIL EXPENDITURE INSTRUCTION	PER PUPIL EXPENDITURE ADMINSITRAT'N	PER PUPIL EXPENDITURE OPERATION
BORDEWICH-BRAY E.	541	-22.7%	24.2%	94.0%	361	30.0%	NR	NR	NR
FREMONT E.	627	0.5%	16.2%	95.6%	627	95.8%	NR	NR	NR
FRITSCH E.	725	-4.0%	25.9%	94.3%	725	96.5%	NR	NR	NR
SEELIGER E.	756	-4.1%	15.7%	94.8%	756	90.0%	NR	NR	NR
TWAIN E.	561	115.8%	66.0%	93.2%	561	87.0%	NR	NR	NR
EMPIRE E.	602	-7.2%	28.6%	94.3%	602	83.0%	NR	NR	NR

CHURCHILL

SCHOOL	ENROLL	ENROLL CHANGE	TRANS'Y RATE	ATTEND RATE	COUNSEL /STUDNT	PAR'NT/T'CHR CONFERNECE ATTENDANCE	PER PUPIL EXPENDITURE INSTRUCTION	PER PUPIL EXPENDITURE ADMINISTRAT'N	PER PUPIL EXPENDITURE OPERATION
BEST E.	789	5.8%	24.8%	94.5%	789	58.0%	$2813	$457	$178
LAHONTAN E.	520	0.0%	24.4%	96.1%	520	75.6%	$2839	$471	$244
NORTHSIDE E.	519	-13.5%	1.6%	97.1%	519	78.0%	$2831	$455	$244
WEST END E.	440	-14.1%	19.0%	94.9%	440	94.0%	$2855	$466	$279

ELEMENTARY SCHOOL CHARACTERISTICS

CLARK

SCHOOL	ENROLL	ENROLL CHANGE	TRANS'Y RATE	ATTEND RATE	COUNSEL /STUDNT	PAR'NT/T'CHR CONFERENCE ATTENDANCE	PER PUPIL EXPENDITURE INSTRUCTION	PER PUPIL EXPENDITURE ADMINISTRAT'N	PER PUPIL EXPENDITURE OPERATIONS
LAUGHLIN HIGH/JR H	431	12.5%	26.8%	93.2%	431	10.0%	$3253	$906	$1509
MOAPA VAL'Y HIGH/JR	865	10.3%	8.0%	93.3%	433	50.0%	$3145	$728	$630
VIRGIN VAL'Y HIGH/JR	500	8.2%	17.9%	93.5%	500	43.0%	$4127	$929	$1012
BROWN JUNIOR HIGH	858	4.9%	27.1%	93.6%	429	33.0%	$2703	$689	$508
CANNON JUNIOR HI	1073	16.8%	22.0%	92.7%	537	65.0%	$2493	$612	$494
FREMONT JUNIOR HI	941	-5.0%	33.3%	92.5%	471	60.0%	$2889	$657	$495
GREENSPUN JR HIGH	1512	-4.8%	14.3%	93.6%	504	45.0%	$2553	$601	$436
KNUDSON JUNIOR HI	775	-5.1%	33.1%	90.8%	388	70.0%	$2777	$750	$518
SANDY VAL'Y JR HIGH	68	15.3%	12.8%	91.3%	360	85.0%	$2950	$1243	$594
VON TOBEL JUNIOR H	1072	0.8%	34.8%	92.4%	536	50.0%	$2442	$618	$536
BRIDGER MIDDLE S	1057	-2.0%	34.6%	92.8%	529	50.0%	$2533	$625	$476
BURKHOLDER MID S	1116	1.0%	23.4%	94.0%	558	80.0%	$2449	$599	$471
CASHMAN MIDDLE S	923	-1.3%	34.7%	87.4%	462	75.0%	$2798	$670	$531
GARRETT MIDDLE S	604	4.7%	20.0%	94.7%	604	50.0%	$3176	$858	$563
GIBSON MIDDLE SCH	1008	-22.7%	29.0%	91.0%	504	50.0%	$2740	$651	$445
MARTIN MIDDLE SCH	944	-1.3%	36.9%	91.8%	315	40.0%	$2968	$681	$503
ORR MIDDLE SCHOOL	1071	-10.6%	39.5%	91.6%	536	33.0%	$2446	$627	$502
ROBISON MIDDLE S	1196	-12.4%	30.3%	93.3%	399	40.0%	$2549	$590	$497
SMITH MIDDLE SCH	811	-32.2%	37.2%	90.9%	406	NR	$2521	$689	$534

ELEMENTARY SCHOOL CHARACTERISTICS

CLARK (CONT.)

SCHOOL	ENROLL	ENROLL CHANGE	TRANS'Y RATE	ATTEND RATE	COUNSEL /STUDNT	PAR'NT/T'CHR CONFERENCE ATTENDANCE	PER PUPIL EXPENDITURE INSTRUCTION	PER PUPIL EXPENDITURE ADMINISTRAT'N	PER PUPIL EXPENDITURE OPERATIONS
SWAINSTON MID SCH	1444	0.0	29.5%	93.1%	481	85.0%	$2432	$609	$431
WHITE MIDDLE SCH	900	0.0	29.0%	93.9%	450	83.0%	$2531	$656	$607
WOODBURY MIDDLE	1129	-10.3%	24.2%	90.4%	565	80.0%	$2923	$624	$490
CARSON 6TH	459	4.3%	29.2%	90.2%	459	70.0%	$3293	$601	$521
GILBERT 6TH	1373	-1.8%	20.4%	88.1%	1373	60.0%	$2415	$494	$330
HOGGARD 6TH	505	-3.4%	27.1%	88.9%	505	89.0%	$2825	$793	$522
KELLY 6TH	490	-8.4%	25.0%	87.2%	490	90.0%	$2959	$603	$541
MACKEY 6TH	528	-8.3%	28.6%	92.3%	528	60.0%	$3248	$741	$566
MADISON 6TH	691	3.6%	29.4%	87.9%	691	60.0%	$2741	$497	$441
MCCALL 6TH	516	-7.9%	28.9%	89.4%	516	90.0%	$3107	$734	$493
ADAMS E	544	29.5%	26.8%	94.8%	0	93.0%	$2575	$557	$432
ADCOCK E.	563	3.1%	22.0%	93.3%	1126	90.0%	$3152	$652	$424
ANTONELLO E.	589	0.0	27.6%	95.0%	0	96.0%	$2279	$523	$457
BARTLETT E.	551	0.0	23.7%	95.5%	0	98.0%	$2491	$551	$424
BEATTY E.	579	10.9%	23.8%	93.8%	0	92.0%	$2395	$556	$386
BECKLEY E.	664	-12.7%	31.5%	93.5%	1328	93.0%	$2987	$496	$416
BELL E.	679	6.9%	43.8%	92.4%	1358	99.0%	$2742	$586	$395
BENDORF E.	502	0.0	33.0%	94.6%	0	99.0%	$2566	$564	$426
BENNETT E.	450	-8.2%	30.9%	93.2%	450	97.0%	$3227	$587	$491

ELEMENTARY SCHOOL CHARACTERISTICS

CLARK (CONT.)

SCHOOL	ENROLL	ENROLL CHANGE	TRANS'Y RATE	ATTEND RATE	COUNSEL /STUDNT	PAR'NT/T'CHR CONFERENCE ATTENDANCE	PER PUPIL EXPENDITURE INSTRUCTION	PER PUPIL EXPENDITURE ADMINISTRAT'N	PER PUPIL EXPENDITURE OPERATIONS
BOWLER E.	557	-4.3%	11.2%	94.8%	1114	99.0%	$3235	$572	$447
BRACKEN E.	581	10.9%	35.2%	91.9%	1162	NR	$2963	$540	$416
CAHLAN E.	474	-3.1%	32.3%	92.8%	474	85.0%	$3503	$558	$498
CHRISTENSEN E.	589	-30.5%	16.7%	95.3%	0	97.0%	$2658	$538	$388
COX, C. E.	525	6.9%	32.4%	92.7%	1050	86.0%	$2920	$628	$471
COX, D. E.	832	9.8%	21.4%	94.5%	1664	95.0%	$2452	$464	$387
CRAIG E.	599	-14.3%	48.5%	90.6%	599	65.0%	$3032	$691	$423
CRESTWOOD E.	605	5.4%	33.1%	93.4%	1210	94.0%	$3289	$622	$415
CULLEY E.	769	-4.2%	24.6%	93.8%	1538	93.0%	$2319	$579	$370
CUNNINGHAM E.	572	-0.7%	44.0%	91.8%	1144	85.0%	$3121	$584	$482
DAILEY E.	542	-0.2%	37.0%	92.8%	1084	70.0%	$2349	$553	$446
DEARING E.	630	9.2%	28.2%	92.9%	1260	80.0%	$3078	$540	$411
DECKER E.	714	-1.7%	24.1%	93.6%	1428	90.0%	$2976	$530	$391
DERFELT E.	849	13.5%	28.7%	94.2%	1698	NR	$2602	$518	$361
DESKIN E.	715	3.3%	19.7%	94.7%	0	88.0%	$2671	$509	$367
DISKEN E.	720	-13.5%	30.2%	93.0%	1440	87.0%	$2498	$534	$420
DONDERO E.	785	-0.1%	25.8%	93.4%	1570	96.0%	$2808	$516	$402
DOOLEY E.	442	-11.1%	14.0%	95.9%	0	99.0%	$3562	$626	$510
EARL, I. E.	791	-1.5%	35.5%	93.1%	1582	95.0%	$2428	$504	$405

ELEMENTARY SCHOOL CHARACTERISTICS

CLARK (CONT.)

SCHOOL	ENROLL	ENROLL CHANGE	TRANS'Y RATE	ATTEND RATE	COUNSEL /STUDNT	PAR'NT/T'CHR CONFERENCE ATTENDANCE	PER PUPIL EXPENDITURE INSTRUCTION	PER PUPIL EXPENDITURE ADMINISTRAT'N	PER PUPIL EXPENDITURE OPERATIONS
EARL, M. E.	714	4.4%	22.7%	94.5%	1428	95.0%	$2785	$478	$372
EDWARDS E.	843	3.2%	25.4%	94.1%	843	95.0%	$2392	$483	$392
EISENBERG-KA E.	1292	8.8%	20.8%	94.6%	0	85.0%	$2560	$503	$410
FERRON E.	606	-4.1%	30.6%	94.1%	1212	98.0%	$3442	$665	$455
FONG E.	712	9.9%	29.6%	94.0%	1424	70.0%	$2347	$471	$397
FRENCH E.	633	0.3%	16.7%	94.7%	0	96.0%	$3151	$515	$396
FYFE E.	525	-3.3%	24.1%	93.8%	0	98.0%	$3532	$516	$436
GALLOWAY E.	845	5.1%	18.8%	94.8%	1690	99.0%	$2592	$548	$375
GIBSON E.	595	-26.4%	10.4%	96.2%	1190	98.0%	$2312	$522	$404
GRAGSON E.	815	-4.7%	29.1%	91.6%	815	85.0%	$3555	$650	$394
GRAY E.	619	2.7%	22.0%	94.1%	0	75.0%	$3113	$508	$401
GRIFFITH	366	2.2%	32.4%	94.1%	732	90.0%	$3352	$678	$518
HANCOCK E.	643	0.6%	25.7%	93.7%	0	60.0%	$2624	$489	$374
HARMON E.	678	2.4%	24.1%	94.3%	0	93.0%	$2699	$554	$421
HARRIS E.	637	3.9%	21.7%	94.1%	0	99.0%	$2686	$520	$460
HEARD E.	750	-4.8%	21.6%	96.3%	1500	97.0%	$2561	$570	$363
HERR E.	688	7.0%	37.8%	92.8%	1376	95.0%	$2302	$543	$368
HERRON E.	1299	3.6%	43.7%	90.7%	1299	70.0%	$3092	$533	$335
HEWESTON E.	977	-1.1%	36.6%	91.3%	977	50.0%	$2791	$561	$359

ELEMENTARY SCHOOL CHARACTERISTICS

CLARK (CONT.)

SCHOOL	ENROLL	ENROLL CHANGE	TRANS'Y RATE	ATTEND RATE	COUNSEL /STUDNT	PAR'NT/T'CHR CONFERENCE ATTENDANCE	PER PUPIL EXPENDITURE INSTRUCTION	PER PUPIL EXPENDITURE ADMINISTRAT'N	PER PUPIL EXPENDITURE OPERATIONS
HILL E.	797	-8.0%	18.3%	95.0%	1594	99.0%	$2281	$481	$369
HINMAN E.	603	5.4%	28.9%	93.9%	1206	97.0%	$2706	$525	$407
INDIAN SPRINGS E.	176	3.5%	32.1%	92.1%	176	90.0%	$3724	$407	$243
JACOBSON E.	785	11.2%	17.6%	94.4%	0	90.0%	$2370	$507	$342
JYDSTRUP E.	763	13.9%	41.6%	91.0%	1526	87.0%	$2571	$507	$367
KATZ-MCMILLAN E.	1365	26.0%	30.5%	93.3%	0	95.0%	$2358	$515	$414
KIM E.	618	4.2%	13.5%	94.7%	0	95.0%	$2294	$589	$403
KING, M.L. E.	564	2.5%	37.6%	92.5%	1128	93.0%	$2862	$627	$425
KING, M.P. E	513	-0.4%	15.5%	94.8%	1026	98.0%	$2390	$560	$447
LAKE E.	766	-12.5%	35.7%	92.4%	1532	95.0%	$2997	$542	$373
LINCOLN E.	565	-27.6%	36.9%	92.7%	565	80.0%	$3057	$531	$439
LONG E.	658	-6.3%	23.5%	94.6%	0	80.0%	$2990	$514	$394
LUNT E.	755	14.0%	41.3%	90.1%	1510	70.0%	$2590	$495	$379
LYNCH E.	636	3.9%	35.0%	92.5%	1272	85.0%	$2816	$529	$390
MACK E.	769	4.6%	24.6%	94.5%	1538	100.0%	$2550	$612	$383
MANCH E.	730	-19.5%	43.8%	92.8%	730	30.0%	$2534	$568	$389
MAY E.	700	17.6%	22.2%	93.8%	0	93.0%	$2427	$541	$433
MCCAW E.	814	0.0	21.7%	94.3%	1628	95.0%	$2514	$520	$335
MCDONIEL E.	635	10.1%	17.5%	95.5%	0	98.0%	$2654	$523	$383

ELEMENTARY SCHOOL CHARACTERISTICS

CLARK (CONT.)

SCHOOL	ENROLL	ENROLL CHANGE	TRANS'Y RATE	ATTEND RATE	COUNSEL /STUDNT	PAR'NT/T'CHR CONFERENCE ATTENDANCE	PER PUPIL EXPENDITURE INSTRUCTION	PER PUPIL EXPENDITURE ADMINISTRAT'N	PER PUPIL EXPENDITURE OPERATIONS
MCWILLIAMS E.	465	-4.5%	28.7%	93.7%	0	70.0%	$3122	$556	$466
MENDOZA E.	736	10.2%	26.5%	94.4%	0	99.0%	$2464	$596	$389
MITCHELL E.	432	1.9%	16.9%	94.6%	864	99.0%	$2973	$600	$502
MOUNTAIN VIEW E.	671	-3.3%	30.9%	93.6%	1342	75.0%	$2627	$634	$419
PARADISE E.	397	6.1%	42.0%	92.7%	794	91.0%	$3552	$792	$558
PARK E.	795	9.8%	36.1%	92.3%	1590	75.0%	$2998	$521	$353
PARSON E.	677	-3.4%	30.1%	94.6%	1354	98.0%	$2495	$508	$387
PERKINS E.	219	1.4%	16.1%	93.5%	438	96.0%	$2901	$944	$710
PITTMAN E.	560	8.7%	30.5%	93.5%	1120	98.0%	$3242	$565	$469
RED ROCK E.	618	-3.4%	28.2%	93.6%	1236	90.0%	$3369	$603	$413
REED E.	623	-20.2%	21.6%	94.1%	0	89.0%	$2687	$538	$395
RONNOW E	808	0.4%	38.0%	92.6%	1616	85.0%	$2626	$496	$410
RONZONE E.	656	5.5%	31.5%	93.3%	1312	95.0%	$2423	$497	$429
ROWE E.	582	-18.7%	33.6%	93.5%	1164	85.0%	$2956	$517	$451
RUNDLE E.	689	1.9%	27.9%	93.0%	0	90.0%	$2599	$518	$445
SANDY VALLEY E.	112	16.7%	22.8%	92.6%	360	85.0%	$2950	$1243	$594
SEWELL E.	771	-4.2%	32.7%	93.5%	1542	70.0%	$2830	$590	$385
SMITH, H. E.	572	-1.7%	22.6%	94.6%	0	83.0%	$2806	$543	$428
SQUIRES E.	623	-1.1%	42.2%	91.3%	1246	85.0%	$2816	$582	$410

ELEMENTARY SCHOOL CHARACTERISTICS

CLARK (CONT.)

SCHOOL	ENROLL	ENROLL CHANGE	TRANS'Y RATE	ATTEND RATE	COUNSEL /STUDNT	PAR'NT/T'CHR CONFERENCE ATTENDANCE	PER PUPIL EXPENDITURE INSTRUCTION	PER PUPIL EXPENDITURE ADMINISTRAT'N	PER PUPIL EXPENDITURE OPERATIONS
STANFORD E.	630	-3.2%	14.2%	95.5%	0	94.0%	$2722	$522	$396
SUNRISE ACRE E.	584	11.2%	41.3%	91.1%	584	80.0%	$3104	$495	$429
TATE E.	610	-8.1%	30.2%	93.6%	1220	90.0%	$2862	$607	$450
TAYLOR, R. E.	578	5.9%	31.0%	92.7%	0	96.0%	$3274	$559	$461
THOMAS E.	854	18.0%	48.7%	89.9%	1708	85.0%	$3267	$544	$397
THORPE E.	548	0.0	30.5%	94.0%	0	90.0%	$2596	$542	$422
TOBLER E.	657	10.4%	22.0%	95.1%	1314	90.0%	$2968	$502	$387
TOMIYASU E.	728	27.3%	26.1%	94.5%	0	90.0%	$2972	$509	$427
TREEM E.	441	-43.5%	28.8%	94.2%	0	87.0%	$2398	$597	$482
TWIN LAKES E.	591	2.1%	39.4%	92.0%	1182	67.0%	$2874	$521	$398
ULLOM E.	567	0.9%	35.2%	92.4%	1134	94.0%	$3204	$545	$423
VEGAS VERDES E.	754	-1.3%	32.7%	92.8%	0	97.0%	$2094	$461	$358
VIRGIN VALLEY E.	447	3.5%	15.0%	95.0%	0	100.0%	$3328	$569	$636
WARD E.	653	12.6%	40.6%	91.3%	1306	80.0%	$2618	$492	$422
WARREN E.	577	6.5%	26.0%	93.5%	1154	80.0%	$3013	$526	$433
WASDEN E.	594	-7.5%	28.5%	93.7%	1188	58.0%	$3228	$583	$461
WENGERT E.	669	11.7%	25.6%	94.4%	1338	92.0%	$2802	$559	$431
WHITNEY E.	516	1.6%	35.0%	94.1%	1032	97.0%	$2843	$549	$476
WILLIAMS E.	702	11.8%	30.3%	93.1%	1404	77.0%	$2918	$493	$366

ELEMENTARY SCHOOL CHARACTERISTICS

CLARK (CONT.)

SCHOOL	ENROLL	ENROLL CHANGE	TRANS'Y RATE	ATTEND RATE	COUNSEL /STUDNT	PAR'NT/T'CHR CONFERENCE ATTENDANCE	PER PUPIL EXPENDITURE INSTRUCTION	PER PUPIL EXPENDITURE ADMINISTRAT'N	PER PUPIL EXPENDITURE OPERATIONS
WOOLLEY E.	539	0.4%	32.1%	92.6%	1078	73.0%	$2420	$596	$459
WYNN E.	658	-2.7%	37.0%	93.2%	0	85.0%	$2712	$488	$375
WASDEN JUNIOR HI	594	-7.5%	28.5%	93.7%	1188	NR	$3228	$583	$461
BOOKER 6TH	981	32.7%	22.8%	84.4%	491	50.0%	$2556	$517	$380

DOUGLAS

SCHOOL	ENROLL	ENROLL CHANGE	TRANS'Y RATE	ATTEND RATE	COUNSEL /STUDNT	PAR'NT/T'CHR CONFERNECE ATTENDANCE	PER PUPIL EXPENDITURE INSTRUCTION	PER PUPIL EXPENDITURE ADMINISTRAT'N	PER PUPIL EXPENDITURE OPERATION
KINGSBURY MIDDLE S	286	7.9%	22.0%	96.3%	286	75.5%	$2538	$614	$505
GARDNERVILLE E.	697	8.2%	12.9%	93.4%	697	89.5%	$2926	$402	$477
JACKS VALLEY E.	821	6.1%	19.0%	93.3%	821	90.0%	$2750	$447	$484
MENELEY E.	827	31.5%	14.0%	93.6%	827	94.5%	$2837	$438	$480
SCARSELLI E.	779	-12.6%	20.0%	93.3%	779	95.2%	$3045	$461	$477
ZEPHYR COVE E.	363	9.0%	24.8%	92.0%	363	95.0%	$3422	$508	$496

ELEMENTARY SCHOOL CHARACTERISTICS

ELKO

SCHOOL	ENROLL	ENROLL CHANGE	TRANS'Y RATE	ATTEND RATE	COUNSEL /STUDNT	PAR'NT/T'CHR CONFERENCE ATTENDANCE	PER PUPIL EXPENDITURE INSTRUCTION	PER PUPIL EXPENDITURE ADMINISTRAT'N	PER PUPIL EXPENDITURE OPERATION
CARLIN COMPLETE S	498	3.8%	28.0%	92.2%	498	90.0%	$3359	$705	$1558
JACKPOT COMP.S	302	-8.8%	29.7%	92.1%	302	80.0%	$4492	$780	$2011
OWYHEE COMP. S	369	5.4%	26.2%	92.8%	369	85.0%	$4208	$868	$2012
WELL COMPLETE S	451	5.6%	20.8%	91.2%	451	85.7%	$4030	$912	$2096
ELKO GRAMMAR2 E	529	4.7%	23.6%	93.8%	529	95.0%	$3392	$388	$1029
MT. VIEW E	948	18.5%	23.8%	93.7%	948	96.0%	$2489	$402	$901
NORTHSIDE E	512	6.6%	17.7%	94.0%	512	94.0%	$3208	$388	$1047
RURALS E	130	2.3%	18.8%	93.5%	0	100.0%	NR	NR	NR
SAGE E	455	14.8%	26.8%	93.5%	455	96.0%	$2728	$419	$1088
SOUTHSIDE E	690	0.9%	22.6%	94.1%	690	94.7%	$3253	$445	$1006
SPRING CREEK E	591	-9.7%	17.4%	94.5%	591	96.0%	$2655	$384	$1058
WEST WENDOVER E	651	9.4%	30.0%	93.6%	651	90.0%	$2933	$333	$854

ESMERALDA

SCHOOL	ENROLL	ENROLL CHANGE	TRANS'Y RATE	ATTEND RATE	COUNSEL /STUDNT	PAR'NT/T'CHR CONFERENCE ATTENDANCE	PER PUPIL EXPENDITURE INSTRUCTION	PER PUPIL EXPENDITURE ADMINISTRAT'N	PER PUPIL EXPENDITURE OPERATION
ALL	143	-3.4%	33.3%	92.5%	477	95.0%	NR	NR	NR

ELEMENTARY SCHOOL CHARACTERISTICS

EUREKA

SCHOOL	ENROLL	ENROLL CHANGE	TRANS'Y RATE	ATTEND RATE	COUNSEL /STUDNT	PAR'NT/T'CHR CONFERENCE ATTENDANCE	PER PUPIL EXPENDITURE INSTRUCTION	PER PUPIL EXPENDITURE ADMINISTRAT'N	PER PUPIL EXPENDITURE OPERATION
EUREKA E	134	12.4%	25.1%	93.2%	134	80.0%	$6486	$2494	$1814
BEOWAWE E	45	28.6%	28.6%	93.3%	0	100.0%	$6059	$1145	$1814

HUMBOLDT

SCHOOL	ENROLL	ENROLL CHANGE	TRANS'Y RATE	ATTEND RATE	COUNSEL /STUDNT	PAR'NT/T'CHR CONFERENCE ATTENDANCE	PER PUPIL EXPENDITURE INSTRUCTION	PER PUPIL EXPENDITURE ADMINISTRAT'N	PER PUPIL EXPENDITURE OPERATION
MCDERMITT COMP S	209	-6.2%	28.0%	92.3%	209	67.0%	$5349	$1071	$1122
WINNEMUCCA JR. H	718	10.9%	14.8%	94.0%	359	62.0%	$2379	$287	$269
GRASS VALLEY E	557	-2.3%	22.0%	94.6%	557	94.7%	$2821	$243	$266
RURALS E.	117	2.5%	33.7%	93.5%	117	NR	$4470	$26	$567
SONOMA HEIGHT E	615	24.2	23.3%	94.5%	O	96.0%	$2331	$214	$264
WINNEMUCCH GR' E	363	-9.0	25.8%	94.3%	363	97.0%	$3346	$293	$325

ELEMENTARY SCHOOL CHARACTERISTICS

LANDER

SCHOOL	ENROLL	ENROLL CHANGE	TRANS'Y RATE	ATTEND RATE	COUNSEL /STUDNT	PAR'NT/T'CHR CONFERENCE ATTENDANCE	PER PUPIL EXPENDITURE INSTRUCTION	PER PUPIL EXPENDITURE ADMINISTRAT'N	PER PUPIL EXPENDITURE OPERATION
BATTLE MT. JR.H	350	0.1%	19.7%	94.3%	350	85.0%	$2802	$617	$474
AUSTIN E	61	14.1%	29.1%	94.5%	419	37.1%	$3153	$547	$679
BLACK/PIERCE E	742	-1.3%	45.1%	94.3%	742	93.7%	$3039	$423	$427

LINCOLN

SCHOOL	ENROLL	ENROLL CHANGE	TRANS'Y RATE	ATTEND RATE	COUNSEL /STUDNT	PAR'NT/T'CHR CONFERENCE ATTENDANCE	PER PUPIL EXPENDITURE INSTRUCTION	PER PUPIL EXPENDITURE ADMINISTRAT'N	PER PUPIL EXPENDITURE OPERATION
CALIENTE E	137	1.0%	20.7%	94.4%	NR	90.0%	$3901	$206	$406
PAHRANAGAT E	187	0.0	1.6%	94.0%	NR	70.0%	$3799	$160	$299
PANACA E	115	4.5%	19.2%	96.4%	NR	95.0%	$4232	$780	$541
PIOCHE E	63	-4.5%	53.0%	95.0%	NR	95.0%	$5860	$497	$690

ELEMENTARY SCHOOL CHARACTERISTICS

LYON

SCHOOL	ENROLL	ENROLL CHANGE	TRANS'Y RATE	ATTEND RATE	COUNSEL /STUDNT	PAR'NT/T'CHR CONFERENCE ATTENDANCE	PER PUPIL EXPENDITURE INSTRUCTION	PER PUPIL EXPENDITURE ADMINISTRAT'N	PER PUPIL EXPENDITURE OPERATION
SMITH VAL'Y COMP S	246	1.2%	13.4%	92.8%	246	73.2%	$3330	$713	$822
DAYTON INTERMED S	406	13.7%	29.5%	91.5%	271	48.5%	$2659	$576	$573
FERNLEY INTERMED S	516	3.6%	24.5%	92.7%	516	54.3%	$2341	$651	$677
YERINGTON INTERM S	411	6.5%	18.6%	93.8%	411	68.1%	$2811	$562	$546
COTTONWOOD E	195	4.8%	22.9%	95.1%	390	97.9%	$2885	$796	$708
DAYTON E	569	6.6%	15.1%	93.1%	569	96.5%	$2885	$444	$592
FERNLEY E	329	-7.6%	29.1%	93.7%	658	95.1%	$2728	$627	$639
SILVER SPRINGS E	241	8.1%	32.9%	92.7%	241	79.3%	$2448	$692	$652
YERINGTON E	546	0.2%	17.0%	93.0%	546	90.8%	$2795	$483	$535

MINERAL

SCHOOL	ENROLL	ENROLL CHANGE	TRANS'Y RATE	ATTEND RATE	COUNSEL /STUDNT	PAR'NT/T'CHR CONFERENCE ATTENDANCE	PER PUPIL EXPENDITURE INSTRUCTION	PER PUPIL EXPENDITURE ADMINISTRAT'N	PER PUPIL EXPENDITURE OPERATION
HAWTHORNE E	730	4.0%	16.4%	93.7%	285	53.0%	$2094	$504	$851
SCHURZ E	114	10.6%	18.7%	90.7%	627	NR	$3975	$613	$575

ELEMENTARY SCHOOL CHARACTERISTICS

NYE

SCHOOL	ENROLL	ENROLL CHANGE	TRANS'Y RATE	ATTEND RATE	COUNSEL /STUDNT	PAR'NT/T'CHR CONFERENCE ATTENDANCE	PER PUPIL EXPENDITURE INSTRUCTION	PER PUPIL EXPENDITURE ADMINISTRAT'N	PER PUPIL EXPENDITURE OPERATIONS
PAHRUMP 5/6TH	321	23.0%	24.0%	92.0%	321	79.4%	$2129	$682	$408
ARMAGOSA VALLEY E	143	-6.5%	13.9%	93.4%	537	96.0%	$3636	$1017	$841
BEATTY E	223	0.0	27.6%	93.0%	537	NR	$2759	$552	$671
GABBS E	108	16.7%	27.0%	93.0%	482	50.0%	$3499	$850	$917
PAHRUMP INTERM S	399	8.0%	24.3%	93.0%	670	NR	$2440	$669	$547
PAHRUMP PRIMARY	271	3.8%	35.0%	90.8%	670	97.0%	$2771	$769	$513
ROUND MT. E	246	10.5%	78.0%	93.7%	479	98.0%	$3071	$768	$553
SILVER RIM E	166	11.7%	26.2%	93.9%	495	NR	$2559	$384	$161
TONOPAH E	329	4.4%	25.9%	94.3%	495	60.0%	$2949	$709	$792

PERSHING

SCHOOL	ENROLL	ENROLL CHANGE	TRANS'Y RATE	ATTEND RATE	COUNSEL /STUDNT	PAR'NT/T'CHR CONFERENCE ATTENDANCE	PER PUPIL EXPENDITURE INSTRUCTION	PER PUPIL EXPENDITURE ADMINISTRAT'N	PER PUPIL EXPENDITURE OPERATIONS
PERSHING MIDDLE S	195	3.7%	18.5%	90.7%	0	61.0%	$2524	$733	$762
LOVELOCK E	436	-9.0%	20.6%	94.1%	436	92.2%	$4106	$266	$509

ELEMENTARY SCHOOL CHARACTERISTICS

STOREY

SCHOOL	ENROLL	ENROLL CHANGE	TRANS'Y RATE	ATTEND RATE	COUNSEL /STUDNT	PAR'NT/T'CHR CONFERENCE ATTENDANCE	PER PUPIL EXPENDITURE INSTRUCTION	PER PUPIL EXPENDITURE ADMINISTRAT'N	PER PUPIL EXPENDITURE OPERATIONS
VIRGINIA CITY MIDDLE	97	12.7%	23.1%	94.3%	388	66.0%	$3741	$1479	$753
GALLAGHER E	174	-1.6%	22.6%	96.3%	696	98.8%	$3109	$1125	$594
HILLSIDE E	50	-3.6%	12.3%	95.5%	100	86.2%	$3718	$2232	$1090

ELEMENTARY SCHOOL CHARACTERISTICS

WASHOE

SCHOOL	ENROLL	ENROLL CHANGE	TRANS'Y RATE	ATTEND RATE	COUNSEL /STUDNT	PAR'NT/T'CHR CONFERENCE ATTENDANCE	PER PUPIL EXPENDITURE INSTRUCTION	PER PUPIL EXPENDITURE ADMINISTRAT'N	PER PUPIL EXPENDITURE OPERATIONS
GERLACH HIGH	70	6.1%	36.0%	94.0%	360	100.0%	$5545	$1792	$1077
INCLINE MIDDLE S	312	3.7%	25.0%	92.0%	312	NR	$2971	$621	$662
ALLEN E.	611	7.4%	66.0%	95.0%	609	NR	$2752	$334	$318
ANDERSON E.	513	1.8%	97.0%	93.0%	514	85.0%	$2617	$373	$345
BECK E.	428	-1.2%	12.0%	96.0%	1070	90.3%	$2584	$431	$361
BOOTH E.	476	3.3%	80.0%	94.0%	476	78.9%	$3056	$386	$385
BROWN E.	652	10.9%	24.0%	95.0%	1085	91.3%	$2549	$346	$376
CANNAN E.	599	4.9%	48.0%	94.0%	599	87.0%	$2730	$346	$355
CORBETT, R. E.	524	7.6%	81.0%	94.0%	510	75.0%	$2895	$362	$313
DIEDRICHSEN E.	517	-18.2%	9.0%	97.0%	1034	94.0%	$2483	$414	$378
DODSON E.	472	4.8%	18.0%	96.0%	944	85.0%	$2771	$410	$364
DRAKE E.	425	-7.8%	31.0%	96.0%	848	93.0%	$2605	$430	$369
DUNCAN E.	558	0.2%	69.0%	94.0%	558	75.0%	$2495	$367	$329
DUNN E.	680	-0.9%	25.0%	96.0%	1133	80.0%	$2613	$334	$342
ELMCREST E.	569	3.8%	40.0%	95.0%	953	85.0%	$2825	$356	$320
GOMES E.	457	-0.7%	34.0%	95.0%	916	80.0%	$2422	$390	$364
GOMM E.	481	1.3%	19.0%	96.0%	966	99.0%	$2833	$403	$357
GREENBRAE E.	432	-4.2%	35.0%	95.0%	864	85.0%	$2799	$450	$331
HIDDEN VALLEY E.	611	6.4%	35.0%	95.0%	1018	94.0%	$2709	$357	$383
CAUGHLIN RANCH E.	404	21.0%	50.0%	96.0%	1013	94.0%	$2997	$442	$494

ELEMENTARY SCHOOL CHARACTERISTICS

WASHOE (CONT.)

SCHOOL	ENROLL	ENROLL CHANGE	TRANS'Y RATE	ATTEND RATE	COUNSEL /STUDNT	PAR'NT/T'CHR CONFERENCE ATTENDANCE	PER PUPIL EXPENDITURE INSTRUCTION	PER PUPIL EXPENDITURE ADMINISTRAT'N	PER PUPIL EXPENDITURE OPERATIONS
HUFFAKER E.	628	9.4%	21.0%	96.0%	3130	98.0%	$2241	$372	$370
HUNTER LAKE E.	394	-0.3%	36.0%	96.0%	772	96.1%	$2705	$446	$385
INCLINE E.	572	-0.3%	24.0%	94.0%	1144	89.0%	$2720	$359	$399
JOHNSON E.	52	-5.5%	31.0%	95.0%	260	99.0%	$4570	$194	$881
JUNIPER E.	472	-6.2%	24.0%	96.0%	944	97.0%	$2646	$404	$335
LEMMON VALLEY E.	637	-6.2%	26.0%	95.0%	1062	79.0%	$2370	$335	$353
LENZ E.	519	1.0%	20.0%	96.0%	1050	97.8%	$2513	$389	$378
LINCOLN PARK E.	437	-4.0%	49.0%	94.0%	870	85.0%	$2609	$398	$349
LODER E.	302	6.3%	78.0%	95.0%	302	69.0%	$3217	$492	$520
MAXWELL E.	459	6.3%	26.0%	95.0%	920	88.0%	$2733	$409	$362
MITCHELL, R. E.	349	-18.3%	68.0%	94.0%	349	90.0%	$3690	$467	$419
MOSS E.	559	0.0	35.0%	96.0%	1108	91.0%	$2529	$362	$394
MOUNT ROSE E.	350	-6.2%	62.0%	95.0%	583	90.0%	$3010	$484	$432
NATCHEZ E.	237	9.2%	39.0%	92.0%	332	80.0%	$3416	$594	$588
PALMER E.	457	2.9%	52.0%	94.0%	457	76.0%	$3010	$385	$375
PEAVINE E.	386	5.5%	20.0%	96.0%	965	87.9%	$2800	$455	$402
PLEASANT VALLEY E.	437	-3.3%	22.0%	95.0%	1093	95.0%	$2657	$414	$360
RISLEY E.	606	-3.8%	51.0%	95.0%	606	75.0%	$2850	$343	$311
SIERRA VISTA E.	385	2.1%	53.0%	94.0%	385	62.3%	$2593	$439	$390

ELEMENTARY SCHOOL CHARACTERISTICS

WASHOE (CONT.)

SCHOOL	ENROLL	ENROLL CHANGE	TRANS'Y RATE	ATTEND RATE	COUNSEL /STUDNT	PAR'NT/T'CHR CONFERENCE ATTENDANCE	PER PUPIL EXPENDITURE INSTRUCTION	PER PUPIL EXPENDITURE ADMINISTRAT'N	PER PUPIL EXPENDITURE OPERATIONS
SILVER LAKE E.	717	2.6%	30.0%	95.0%	720	92.9%	$2498	$342	$365
SMITH, A. E.	742	6.9%	43.0%	94.0%	747	68.3%	$2620	$338	$369
SMITH, K. E.	338	29.5%	68.0%	94.0%	563	NR	$2623	$444	$403
SMITHRIDGE E.	732	16.7%	71.0%	94.0%	732	87.8%	$2698	$348	$319
STEAD E.	626	6.5%	52.0%	94.0%	629	82.0%	$2574	$329	$359
SUN VALLEY E.	432	0.0%	65.0%	94.0%	432	88.0%	$3482	$411	$467
TAYLOR, A. E.	742	19.7%	23.0%	95.0%	1486	86.0%	$2469	$337	$341
TOWLES E.	426	-6.0%	26.0%	96.0%	849	97.0%	$2917	$433	$342
VERDI E.	327	-0.3%	15.0%	96.0%	815	100.0%	$2477	$475	$431
VETERAN'S E.	396	-8.1%	58.0%	95.0%	396	90.0%	$3222	$451	$421
WARNER E.	407	3.3%	59.0%	95.0%	678	81.7%	$2927	$411	$368
WESTERGARD E.	741	9.8%	21.0%	96.0%	1482	95.0%	$2456	$340	$337
WHITEHEAD E.	475	-14.7%	14.0%	97.0%	1188	96.3%	$2703	$408	$347

ELEMENTARY SCHOOL CHARACTERISTICS

WHITE PINE

SCHOOL	ENROLL	ENROLL CHANGE	TRANS'Y RATE	ATTEND RATE	COUNSEL /STUDNT	PAR'NT/T'CHR CONFERENCE ATTENDANCE	PER PUPIL EXPENDITURE INSTRUCTION	PER PUPIL EXPENDITURE ADMINISTRAT'N	PER PUPIL EXPENDITURE OPERATIONS
LUND E	63	21.0%	12.5%	94.8%	63	98.4%	$3890	$274	$459
MCGILL E	91	6.3%	24.5%	94.4%	91	95.0%	$4054	$1193	$714
MT. VIEW E.	552	5.6%	18.8%	92.5%	552	NR	$2956	$497	$498
WHITE PINE MIDDLE S	384	1.6%	18.8%	92.6%	384	100.0%	$3005	$694	$467

Table C6 – ELEMENTARY CLASSROOMS

CARSON

SCHOOL	CLASS SIZE-K	CLASS SIZE G.1	CLASS SIZE G.2	CLASS SIZE G.3	CLASS SIZE G.4	CLASS SIZE G.5	CLASS SIZE G.6	% T'CHERS IN LICENSE	% T'CHRS W/ B.A. ONLY	TCH.EXPER 10YR+
BORDEWICH-BRAY E.	23.0	16.0	14.0	28.0	22.0	29.0	24.0	100.0%	78.6%	47.6%
FREMONT E.	24.0	15.0	15.0	30.0	29.0	29.0	30.0	100.0%	70.6%	50.0%
FRITSCH E.	23.0	14.0	14.0	24.0	26.0	26.0	28.0	100.0%	78.6%	41.5%
SEELIGER E.	26.0	14.0	13.0	30.0	30.0	30.0	29.0	100.0%	84.6%	41.0%
TWAIN E.	23.0	14.0	14.0	22.0	25.0	27.0	21.0	100.0%	74.3%	22.9%
EMPIRE E.	23.0	13.0	14.0	24.0	26.0	30.0	29.0	100.0%	97.2%	19.5%

CHURCHILL

SCHOOL	CLASS SIZE-K	CLASS SIZE G.1	CLASS SIZE G.2	CLASS SIZE G.3	CLASS SIZE G.4	CLASS SIZE G.5	CLASS SIZE G.6	% T'CHRS IN LICENSE	% T'CHRS W/ B.A. ONLY	TCH.EXPER 10YRS.+
BEST E.	21.0	13.0	16.0	21.0	23.0	25.0	24.0	100.0%	89.6%	31.3%
LAHONTAN E.	19.0	15.0	16.0	20.0	25.0	26.0	27.0	100.0%	79.3%	31.0%
NORTHSIDE E.	19.0	15.0	16.0	22.0	22.0	26.0	25.0	100.0%	92.3%	80.8%
WEST END E.	18.0	16.0	16.0	24.0	25.0	27.0	26.0	100.0%	85.2%	51.9%

ELEMENTARY CLASSROOMS

CLARK

SCHOOL	CLASS SIZE-K	CLASS SIZE G.1	CLASS SIZE G.2	CLASS SIZE G.3	CLASS SIZE G.4	CLASS SIZE G.5	CLASS SIZE G.6	% T'CHRS IN LICENSE	% T'CHRS W/ B.A. ONLY	TCH.EXPER 10YRS.+
LAUGHLIN HIGH/JR H	----	----	----	----	----	----	NR	93.0%	67.0%	0.0
MOAPA VAL'Y HIGH/JR	----	----	----	----	----	----	NR	94.0%	44.0%	38.0%
VIRGIN VAL'Y HIGH/JR	----	----	----	----	----	----	NR	91.0%	22.0%	53.0%
BROWN JUNIOR HIGH	----	----	----	----	----	----	NR	100.0%	40.0%	49.0%
CANNON JUNIOR HI	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	100.0%	37.0%	46.0%
FREMONT JUNIOR HI	----	----	----	----	----	----	NR	100.0%	26.0%	42.0%
GREENSPUN JR HIGH	----	----	----	----	----	----	NR	100.0%	32.0%	46.0%
KNUDSON JUNIOR HI	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	100.0%	49.0%	49.0%
SANDY VAL'Y JR HIGH	----	----	----	----	----	----	NR	100.0%	50.0%	25.0%
VON TOBEL JUNIOR H	----	----	----	----	----	----	NR	100.0%	55.0%	38.0%
BRIDGER MIDDLE SCH	----	----	----	----	----	----	NR	100.0%	43.0%	37.0%
BURKHOLDER MID S	----	----	----	----	----	----	NR	100.0%	45.0%	30.0%
CASHMAN MIDDLE S	----	----	----	----	----	----	NR	92.0%	33.0%	53.0%
GARRETT MIDDLE S	----	----	----	----	----	----	NR	100.0%	35.0%	59.0%
GIBSON MIDDLE SCH	----	----	----	----	----	----	NR	100.0%	36.0%	46.0%
MARTIN MIDDLE SCH	----	----	----	----	----	----	NR	100.0%	44.0%	38.0%
ORR MIDDLE SCHOOL	----	----	----	----	----	----	NR	98.0%	60.0%	25.0%
ROBISON MIDDLE S	----	----	----	----	----	----	NR	98.0%	51.0%	32.0%
SMITH MIDDLE SCH	----	----	----	----	----	----	NR	98.0%	49.0%	28.0%

ELEMENTARY CLASSROOMS

CLARK (CONT.)

SCHOOL	CLASS SIZE-K	CLASS SIZE G.1	CLASS SIZE G.2	CLASS SIZE G.3	CLASS SIZE G.4	CLASS SIZE G.5	CLASS SIZE G.6	% T'CHRS IN LICENSE	% T'CHRS W/ B.A. ONLY	TCH.EXPER 10YRS.+
SWAINSTON MID SCH	----	----	----	----	----	----	NR	100.0%	47.0%	29.0%
WHITE MIDDLE SCH	----	----	----	----	----	----	NR	98.0%	60.0%	13.0%
WOODBURY MIDDLE	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	98.0%	22.0%	61.0%
CARSON 6TH	23.0	----	----	----	----	----	24.2	100.0%	59.0%	30.0%
GILBERT 6TH	15.5	----	----	----	----	----	26.8	100.0%	48.0%	19.0%
HOGGARD 6TH	23.0	----	----	----	----	----	24.2	100.0%	48.0%	28.0%
KELLY 6TH	26.5	----	----	----	----	----	23.0	100.0%	50.0%	35.0%
MACKEY 6TH	19.0	----	----	----	----	----	22.9	100.0%	42.0%	42.0%
MADISON 6TH	23.8	----	----	----	----	----	25.4	100.0%	62.0%	32.0%
MCCALL 6TH	21.5	----	----	----	----	----	23.9	100.0%	29.0%	50.0%
ADAMS E	28.0	16.0	16.4	27.0	28.8	24.0	----	100.0%	67.0%	12.0%
ADCOCK E.	19.3	16.8	14.5	28.3	28.3	33.3	----	100.0%	43.0%	46.0%
ANTONELLO E.	27.0	16.1	15.1	30.0	34.0	32.0	----	100.0%	63.0%	13.0%
BARTLETT E.	25.0	18.4	14.7	32.1	24.6	31.4	----	100.0%	57.0%	20.0%
BEATTY E.	33.0	16.0	15.8	35.3	28.0	32.7	----	100.0%	61.0%	23.0%
BECKLEY E.	16.5	17.6	16.9	31.0	26.8	31.0	----	100.0%	50.0%	45.0%
BELL E.	28.5	15.1	17.9	25.3	24.4	26.0	----	100.0%	64.0%	28.0%
BENDORF E.	20.3	15.1	18.2	27.6	28.2	28.6	----	100.0%	62.0%	14.0%
BENNETT E.	21.7	15.3	15.6	23.0	26.8	29.6	----	100.0%	44.0%	9.0%

ELEMENTARY CLASSROOMS

CLARK (CONT.)

SCHOOL	CLASS SIZE-K	CLASS SIZE G.1	CLASS SIZE G.2	CLASS SIZE G.3	CLASS SIZE G.4	CLASS SIZE G.5	CLASS SIZE G.6	% T'CHRS IN LICENSE	% T'CHRS W/ B.A. ONLY	TCH.EXPER 10YRS+
BOWLER E.	17.5	14.8	17.2	27.0	30.5	27.3	----	100.0%	42.0%	49.0%
BRACKEN E.	20.8	15.4	14.7	25.7	25.3	28.7	----	100.0%	63.0%	24.0%
CAHLAN E.	16.8	17.3	16.7	24.7	30.8	34.0	----	100.0%	60.0%	11.0%
CHRISTENSEN E.	24.3	16.2	17.3	30.3	25.5	30.3	----	100.0%	42.0%	24.0%
COX, C. E.	25.6	17.2	17.3	22.0	----	----	----	100.0%	71.0%	21.0%
COX, D. E.	20.2	16.4	14.6	24.4	27.8	27.8	----	100.0%	64.0%	13.0%
CRAIG E.	20.5	16.2	15.1	24.1	----	----	----	100.0%	55.0%	12.0%
CRESTWOOD E.	28.3	16.8	16.4	24.5	28.5	29.0	----	100.0%	58.0%	16.0%
CULLEY E.	26.3	15.7	16.7	26.7	29.3	28.8	----	100.0%	66.0%	20.0%
CUNNINGHAM E.	21.0	15.5	17.2	22.8	25.5	33.0	----	100.0%	35.0%	53.0%
DAILEY E.	----	----	----	26.6	26.2	28.6	----	100.0%	54.0%	14.0%
DEARING E.	25.8	15.5	17.8	23.0	26.3	32.7	----	100.0%	39.0%	51.0%
DECKER E.	25.5	15.1	16.6	30.3	26.2	30.3	----	100.0%	33.0%	57.0%
DERFELT E.	18.8	15.3	16.8	29.2	31.0	32.3	----	100.0%	46.0%	26.0%
DESKIN E.	25.8	17.1	14.9	25.2	25.6	29.3	----	100.0%	59.0%	42.0%
DISKEN E.	26.5	18.9	14.2	30.0	33.1	32.6	----	100.0%	47.0%	40.0%
DONDERO E.	23.6	15.0	20.7	25.2	33.8	31.5	----	100.0%	29.0%	55.0%
DOOLEY E.	20.3	14.2	15.6	24.3	23.7	28.7	----	100.0%	31.0%	44.0%
EARL, I. E.	21.5	15.8	14.0	31.3	30.0	29.5	----	100.0%	57.0%	27.0%

ELEMENTARY CLASSROOMS

CLARK (CONT.)

SCHOOL	CLASS SIZE-K	CLASS SIZE G.1	CLASS SIZE G.2	CLASS SIZE G.3	CLASS SIZE G.4	CLASS SIZE G.5	CLASS SIZE G.6	% T'CHRS IN LICENSE	% T'CHRS W/ B.A. ONLY	TCH.EXPER 10YRS.+
EARL, M. E.	23.0	15.9	16.7	24.7	27.1	26.7	----	100.0%	35.0%	48.0%
EDWARDS E.	27.0	17.7	16.1	24.9	31.6	29.8	----	100.0%	61.0%	37.0%
EISENBERG-KA E.	22.8	15.2	18.8	28.3	32.8	28.1	----	100.0%	52.0%	32.0%
FERRPM E.	20.3	17.5	14.8	26.8	29.3	29.5	----	100.0%	44.0%	37.0%
FONG E.	21.2	16.9	15.7	34.5	29.5	26.3	----	100.0%	54.0%	24.0%
FRENCH E.	24.0	16.3	15.3	27.8	31.5	25.5	----	100.0%	16.0%	58.0%
FYFE E.	28.0	15.2	16.2	28.6	28.0	29.7	----	100.0%	28.0%	50.0%
GALLOWAY E.	27.6	14.4	16.9	27.3	31.6	31.2	----	100.0%	46.0%	48.0%
GIBSON E.	23.8	16.0	15.7	28.0	31.5	28.0	----	100.0%	64.0%	6.0%
GRAGSON E.	34.3	18.9	20.0	30.5	30.8	31.8	----	100.0%	14.0%	79.0%
GRAY E.	35.0	15.5	15.2	24.3	31.2	31.4	----	100.0%	28.0%	72.0%
GRIFFITH	16.0	17.7	13.9	29.9	24.0	30.8	----	100.0%	62.0%	31.0%
HANCOCK E.	18.5	15.8	16.3	27.0	26.3	33.0	----	100.0%	50.0%	36.0%
HARMON E.	24.0	16.5	20.2	28.5	27.5	29.3	----	100.0%	58.0%	25.0%
HARRIS E.	21.5	15.2	16.0	28.0	24.5	30.5	----	100.0%	53.0%	31.0%
HEARD E.	25.0	16.1	14.8	26.6	27.0	24.0	----	100.0%	50.0%	36.0%
HERR E.	21.3	17.3	14.8	25.5	30.0	28.0	----	100.0%	68.0%	16.0%
HERRON E.	24.1	18.9	18.2	37.3	33.2	34.4	----	100.0%	55.0%	36.0%
HEWESTON E.	21.6	18.3	15.0	24.3	24.8	23.5	----	100.0%	63.0%	21.0%

ELEMENTARY CLASSROOMS

CLARK (CONT.)

SCHOOL	CLASS SIZE-K	CLASS SIZE G.1	CLASS SIZE G.2	CLASS SIZE G.3	CLASS SIZE G.4	CLASS SIZE G.5	CLASS SIZE G.6	% T'CHRS IN LICENSE	% T'CHRS W/ B.A. ONLY	TCH.EXPER .10YRS.+
HILL E.	27.2	16.1	16.4	31.3	29.8	30.5	----	100.0%	50.0%	31.0%
HINMAN E.	23.3	17.2	17.3	25.2	26.8	27.0	----	100.0%	57.0%	11.0%
INDIAN SPRIN E.	12.0	14.0	14.7	24.0	21.0	29.0	34.0	100.0%	50.0%	36.0%
JACOBSON E.	23.6	16.1	15.9	28.0	27.8	28.0	----	100.0%	66.0%	23.0%
JYDSTRUP E.	26.2	16.1	15.3	32.5	29.7	32.9	----	100.0%	66.0%	27.0%
KATZ-MCMILLAN E.	31.6	16.1	16.2	31.1	33.0	33.8	----	100.0%	70.0%	18.0%
KIM E.	21.8	17.0	16.2	32.5	27.8	30.3	----	100.0%	73.0%	24.0%
KING, M.L. E.	27.7	17.1	13.8	26.0	22.0	27.1	----	100.0%	57.0%	11.0%
KING, M.P. E	----	----	----	26.5	32.5	26.5	----	100.0%	56.0%	30.0%
LAKE E.	29.0	16.1	16.8	27.9	33.7	26.0	----	100.0%	49.0%	19.0%
LINCOLN E.	19.8	17.5	14.7	29.7	31.3	28.7	----	100.0%	56.0%	21.0%
LONG E.	21.3	15.9	16.7	26.3	30.8	29.3	----	100.0%	32.0%	53.0%
LUNT E.	25.8	14.6	12.7	25.2	29.5	29.8	----	100.0%	75.0%	11.0%
LYNCH E.	23.4	16.4	15.5	28.5	25.3	32.7	----	100.0%	54.0%	32.0%
MACK E.	28.4	17.8	13.9	24.8	26.4	23.6	----	100.0%	51.0%	34.0%
MANCH E.	27.5	14.3	15.5	25.2	30.8	25.3	----	100.0%	81.0%	9.0%
MAY E.	25.8	18.3	16.4	31.0	28.0	29.5	----	100.0%	58.0%	33.0%
MCCAW E.	24.6	16.9	16.0	29.4	26.0	26.4	----	100.0%	53.0%	24.0%
MCDONIEL E.	26.0	15.1	16.0	27.5	31.0	27.0	----	100.0%	38.0%	44.0%

ELEMENTARY CLASSROOMS

CLARK (CONT.)

SCHOOL	CLASS SIZE-K	CLASS SIZE G.1	CLASS SIZE G.2	CLASS SIZE G.3	CLASS SIZE G.4	CLASS SIZE G.5	CLASS SIZE G.6	% T'CHRS IN LICENSE	% T'CHRS W/ B.A. ONLY	TCH.EXPER 10YRS.+
MCWILLIAMS E.	21.3	14.6	17.0	28.7	28.3	26.3	----	100.0%	57.0%	40.0%
MENDOZA E.	26.0	15.1	14.9	27.3	28.0	28.5	----	100.0%	56.0%	12.0%
MITCHELL E.	25.4	15.9	17.1	----	----	----	----	100.0%	30.0	53.0%
MOUNTAIN VIEW E.	25.5	15.9	15.5	28.5	27.5	27.3	----	100.0%	68.0%	49.0%
PARADISE E.	19.3	16.9	16.4	22.9	27.5	29.9	----	100.0%	59.0%	28.0%
PARK E.	29.0	14.3	13.9	23.3	26.7	27.6	----	100.0%	65.0%	15.0%
PARSON E.	23.3	16.6	16.4	26.3	26.3	29.5	----	100.0%	49.0%	30.0%
PERKINS E.	11.5	18.0	13.5	18.0	20.5	39.0	----	100.0%	86.0%	7.0%
PITTMAN E.	22.3	18.5	16.4	29.0	28.7	31.0	----	100.0%	40.0%	43.0%
RED ROCK E.	22.0	17.9	17.3	29.4	28.9	30.3	----	100.0%	49.0%	29.0%
REED E.	25.7	15.8	16.1	25.3	28.0	26.3	----	100.0%	42.0%	36.0%
RONNOW E	28.0	16.1	17.5	27.6	25.1	30.9	----	100.0%	57.0%	32.0%
RONZONE E.	26.8	17.0	16.7	26.3	30.9	28.6	----	100.0%	54.0%	29.0%
ROWE E.	24.8	15.2	17.1	31.0	32.0	26.3	----	100.0%	58.0%	26.0%
RUNDLE E.	28.0	15.7	15.3	27.8	26.5	24.8	----	100.0%	39.0%	36.0%
SANDY VALLEY E.	18.0	12.0	18.0	20.0	17.0	19.0	----	100.0%	62.0%	31.0%
SEWELL E.	21.3	15.0	15.9	25.4	30.3	24.5	----	100.0%	64.0%	27.0%
SMITH, H. E.	24.3	15.7	15.6	27.8	26.3	26.6	----	100.0%	50.0%	50.0%
SQUIRES E.	20.8	15.8	15.7	27.7	19.8	29.4	----	100.0%	66.0%	15.0%

ELEMENTARY CLASSROOMS

CLARK (CONT.)

SCHOOL	CLASS SIZE-K	CLASS SIZE G.1	CLASS SIZE G.2	CLASS SIZE G.3	CLASS SIZE G.4	CLASS SIZE G.5	CLASS SIZE G.6	% T'CHRS IN LICENSE	% T'CHRS W/ B.A. ONLY	TCH.EXPER 10YRS.+
STANFORD E.	23.0	16.5	16.3	25.5	28.3	27.3	----	100.0%	46.0%	40.0%
SUNRISE ACRE E.	26.5	17.8	14.7	24.8	26.8	24.0	----	100.0%	51.0%	13.0%
TATE E.	24.0	16.0	14.1	27.8	30.3	25.3	----	100.0%	57.0%	22.0%
TAYLOR, R. E.	18.6	18.3	13.7	30.0	30.7	31.3	----	100.0%	66.0%	20.0%
THOMAS E.	22.0	18.9	13.4	29.1	29.4	25.1	----	100.0%	60.0%	20.0%
THORPE E.	27.3	16.3	15.9	----	----	----	----	100.0%	33.0%	27.0%
TOBLER E.	28.0	16.1	14.6	27.7	27.4	28.0	----	100.0%	39.0%	46.0%
TOMIYASU E.	39.7	20.7	18.8	30.3	36.3	35.1	----	100.0%	33.0%	61.0%
TREEM E.	----	----	----	25.8	30.2	32.2	----	100.0%	57.0%	26.0%
TWIN LAKES E.	19.4	15.9	15.8	31.3	32.0	32.7	----	100.0%	43.0%	19.0%
ULLOM E.	27.0	16.7	16.2	24.8	29.7	29.1	----	100.0%	35.0%	50.0%
VEGAS VERDES E.	28.8	15.8	17.9	25.1	29.0	28.4	----	100.0%	76.0%	5.0%
VIRGIN VALLEY E.	23.0	19.0	15.3	27.7	25.3	26.7	----	100.0%	64.0%	32.0%
WARD E.	25.0	17.1	15.9	----	----	----	----	100.0%	47.0%	42.0%
WARREN E.	24.0	16.0	15.8	22.9	28.2	26.7	----	100.0%	42.0%	39.0%
WASDEN E.	28.5	15.4	17.2	28.0	25.4	31.0	----	100.0%	56.0%	43.0%
WENGERT E.	22.0	15.5	17.4	31.8	30.0	31.1	----	100.0%	25.0%	58.0%
WHITNEY E.	28.3	15.6	14.7	28.7	28.7	27.0	----	100.0%	66.0%	22.0%
WILLIAMS E.	19.2	18.1	15.8	28.5	27.0	27.3	----	100.0%	45.0%	45.0%

ELEMENTARY CLASSROOMS

CLARK (CONT.)

SCHOOL	CLASS SIZE-K	CLASS SIZE G.1	CLASS SIZE G.2	CLASS SIZE G.3	CLASS SIZE G.4	CLASS SIZE G.5	CLASS SIZE G.6	% T'CHRS IN LICENSE	% T'CHRS W/ B.A. ONLY	TCH.EXPER 10YRS.+
'VOOLLEY E.	----	----	----	----	29.3	27.5	----	100.0%	63.0%	22.0%
WYNN E.	25.3	15.1	19.5	26.8	27.3	25.3	----	100.0%	50.0%	29.0%
WASDEN JUNIOR HI	----	----	----	----	----	----	23.0	100.0%	56.0%	43.0%
BOOKER 6TH	19.3	----	----	----	----	----	25.1	100.0%	58.0%	27.0%

DOUGLAS

SCHOOL	CLASS SIZE-K	CLASS SIZE G.1	CLASS SIZE G.2	CLASS SIZE G.3	CLASS SIZE G.4	CLASS SIZE G.5	CLASS SIZE G.6	% T'CHRS IN LICENSE	% T'CHRS W/ B.A. ONLY	TCH.EXPER 10YRS.+
KINGSBURY MIDDLE S	----	----	----	----	----	24.3	27.6	91.1%	67.0%	33.0%
GARDNERVILLE E.	23.5	16.7	15.1	24.5	32.7	31.0	31.7	100.0%	68.0%	41.0%
JACKS VALLEY E.	26.8	16.3	14.1	29.1	24.8	20.9	22.5	100.0%	74.0%	26.0%
MENELEY E.	26.8	16.4	15.9	24.9	23.4	28.6	24.6	100.0%	87.0%	23.0%
SCARSELLI E.	23.4	13.8	14.5	26.8	26.0	24.8	28.5	100.0%	73.0%	30.0%
ZEPHYR COVE E.	22.3	15.7	17.7	28.3	26.3	----	----	100.0%	63.0%	55.0%

ELEMENTARY CLASSROOMS

ELKO

SCHOOL	CLASS SIZE-K	CLASS SIZE G.1	CLASS SIZE G.2	CLASS SIZE G.3	CLASS SIZE G.4	CLASS SIZE G.5	CLASS SIZE G.6	% T'CHRS IN LICENSE	% T'CHRS W/ B.A. ONLY	TCH.EXPER 10YRS.+
CARLIN COMPLETE S	20.5	21.0	19.5	21.5	28.0	23.5	21.0	100.0%	93.3	26.7%
JACKPOT COMP.S	20.5	16.0	17.3	18.7	19.4	24.0	21.0	100.0%	92.3%	30.8%
OWYHEE COMP. S	14.0	13.0	18.5	27.3	25.3	24.0	24.7	100.0%	84.6%	46.1%
WELLS COMPLETE S	16.5	20.0	17.5	35.0	27.0	22.0	35.0	100.0%	100.0%	50.0%
ELKO GRAMMAR2 E	19.8	15.8	14.2	25.0	29.3	25.7	30.0	100.0%	80.6%	74.2%
MT. VIEW E	19.6	15.8	14.9	29.5	27.0	26.6	25.6	100.0%	91.8%	36.7%
NORTHSIDE E	19.5	15.0	15.0	30.5	27.0	27.0	27.3	100.0%	90.0%	56.6%
RURALS E	NR	NR	NR	NR	NR	NR	NR	100.0	80.0%	40.0%
SAGE E	16.0	14.8	15.4	25.7	23.7	20.0	----	100.0%	93.1%	10.3%
SOUTHSIDE E	21.0	15.4	14.1	23.8	29.0	29.0	28.7	100.0%	86.4%	59.1%
SPRING CREEK E	16.5	17.3	18.3	24.3	24.3	25.7	26.7	100.0%	81.3%	28.1%
WEST WENDOVER E	18.0	15.7	14.7	24.9	24.0	24.9	24.9	100.0%	95.8%	14.6%

ESMERALDA

SCHOOL	CLASS SIZE-K	CLASS SIZE G.1	CLASS SIZE G.2	CLASS SIZE G.3	CLASS SIZE G.4	CLASS SIZE G.5	CLASS SIZE G.6	% T'CHRS IN LICENSE	% T'CHRS W/ B.A. ONLY	TCH.EXPER 10YRS.+
ALL	10.3	11.1	15.0	14.5	17.9	20.4	14.8	78.6%	85.7%	35.7%

ELEMENTARY CLASSROOMS

EUREKA

SCHOOL	CLASS SIZE-K	CLASS SIZE G.1	CLASS SIZE G.2	CLASS SIZE G.3	CLASS SIZE G.4	CLASS SIZE G.5	CLASS SIZE G.6	% T'CHRS IN LICENSE	% T'CHRS W/ B.A. ONLY	TCH.EXPER 10YRS.+
EUREKA E	12.0	10.0	10.0	16.0	21.0	23.0	9.0	92.0%	77.0%	46.0%
BEOWAWE E	7.0	6.5	6.5	4.5	4.5	7.5	7.5	80.0%	80.0%	60.0%

HUMBOLDT

SCHOOL	CLASS SIZE-K	CLASS SIZE G.1	CLASS SIZE G.2	CLASS SIZE G.3	CLASS SIZE G.4	CLASS SIZE G.5	CLASS SIZE G.6	% T'CHRS IN LICENSE	% T'CHRS W/ B.A. ONLY	TCH.EXPER 10YRS.+
MCDERMITT COMP S	NR	NR	NR	NR	NR	NR	NR	99.9%	76.0%	38.0%
WINNEMUCCA JR. H	----	----	----	----	----	----	27.7	99.7%	86.0%	45.0%
GRASS VALLEY E	23.3	15.5	16.2	18.6	21.0	24.0	----	100.0%	94.3%	31.0%
RURALS E.	1.7	2.8	2.3	2.7	1.8	3.3	2.1	100.0%	100.0%	10.0%
SONOMA HEIGHT E	28.0	14.4	15.8	23.8	25.5	24.8	----	100.0%	91.4%	23.0%
WINNEMUCCH GR' E	27.0	14.4	14.8	19.3	18.6	20.3	----	100.0%	88.5	39.0%

ELEMENTARY CLASSROOMS

LANDER

SCHOOL	CLASS SIZE-K	CLASS SIZE G.1	CLASS SIZE G.2	CLASS SIZE G.3	CLASS SIZE G.4	CLASS SIZE G.5	CLASS SIZE G.6	% T'CHRS IN LICENSE	% T'CHRS W/ B.A. ONLY	TCH.EXPER 10YRS.+
BATTLE MT. JR.H	----	----	----	----	----	----	NR	95.0%	90.0%	38.9%
AUSTIN E	8.0	7.0	10.0	10.0	8.0	10.0	8.0	100.0%	100.0%	40.0%
BLACK/PIERCE E	16.5	16.1	14.1	20.1	18.5	23.0	----	100.0%	78.0%	31.2%

LINCOLN

SCHOOL	CLASS SIZE-K	CLASS SIZE G.1	CLASS SIZE G.2	CLASS SIZE G.3	CLASS SIZE G.4	CLASS SIZE G.5	CLASS SIZE G.6	% T'CHRS IN LICENSE	% T'CHRS W/ B.A. ONLY	TCH.EXPER 10YRS.+
CALIENTE E	13.0	14.0	19.0	18.0	15.0	21.0	17.0	100.0%	90.0%	50.0%
PAHRANAGAT E	20.0	11.0	11.5	15.5	23.0	27.0	32.0	100.0%	67.0%	41.7%
PANACA E	10.0	17.0	14.0	13.0	21.0	12.0	18.0	100.0%	63.0%	87.0%
PIOCHE E	10.0	3.0	7.0	5.0	5.0	13.0	15.0	83.0%	67.0	68.0%

ELEMENTARY CLASSROOMS

LYON

SCHOOL	CLASS SIZE-K	CLASS SIZE G.1	CLASS SIZE G.2	CLASS SIZE G.3	CLASS SIZE G.4	CLASS SIZE G.5	CLASS SIZE G.6	% T'CHRS IN LICENSE	% T'CHRS W/ B.A. ONLY	TCH.EXPER 10YRS.+
SMITH VAL'Y COMP S	10.0	19.0	18.0	17.0	16.0	25.0	21.0	94.1%	82.4%	52.9%
DAYTON INTERMED S	----	----	----	----	----	24.3	25.5	81.8%	68.2%	40.9%
FERNLEY INTERMED S	----	----	----	----	----	26.3	30.8	100.0%	82.1%	50.0%
YERINGTON INTERM S	----	----	----	----	----	23.2	25.0	96.0%	100.0%	36.0%
COTTONWOOD E	14.5	17.0	19.3	20.4	30.0	----	----	100.0%	76.9%	53.8%
DAYTON E	17.2	13.0	16.5	20.8	26.3	----	----	100.0%	86.5%	43.2%
FERNLEY E	19.7	12.6	24.5	22.2	20.1	----	----	100.0%	100.0%	40.0%
SILVER SPRINGS E	22.5	12.0	15.4	26.4	24.7	24.7	----	100.0%	85.7%	7.1%
YERINGTON E	21.6	18.0	13.8	18.0	22.6	----	----	100.0%	88.2%	55.9%

MINERAL

SCHOOL	CLASS SIZE-K	CLASS SIZE G.1	CLASS SIZE G.2	CLASS SIZE G.3	CLASS SIZE G.4	CLASS SIZE G.5	CLASS SIZE G.6	% T'CHRS IN LICENSE	% T'CHRS W/ B.A. ONLY	TCH.EXPER 10YRS.+
HAWTHORNE E	17.6	15.8	15.2	19.0	21.6	26.3	36.6	100.0%	77.7%	62.2%
SCHURZ E	18.0	19.0	20.0	16.0	16.0	16.0	15.0	100.0%	75.0%	100.0%

ELEMENTARY CLASSROOMS

NYE

SCHOOL	CLASS SIZE-K	CLASS SIZE G.1	CLASS SIZE G.2	CLASS SIZE G.3	CLASS SIZE G.4	CLASS SIZE G.5	CLASS SIZE G.6	% T'CHRS IN LICENSE	% T'CHRS W/ B.A. ONLY	TCH.EXPER 10YRS.+
PAHRUMP 5/6TH	----	----	----	----	----	24.6	24.8	100.0%	83.3%	26.6%
ARMAGOSA VALLEY E	15.0	15.0	18.0	15.0	17.0	15.0	12.0	97.8%	70.0%	60.0%
BEATTY E	14.0	12.5	15.5	19.0	20.0	23.0	26.0	100.0%	86.6%	60.0%
GABBS E	16.0	15.8	15.9	14.0	20.9	15.7	13.0	85.7%	85.0%	70.0%
PAHRUMP INTERM S	----	----	17.0	28.0	24.6	----	----	100.0%	81.8%	31.8%
PAHRUMP PRIMARY	14.6	18.5	----	----	----	----	----	100.0%	62.5%	43.8%
ROUND MT. E	14.0	12.3	13.5	19.0	17.0	19.0	12.5	100.0%	78.6%	35.7%
SILVER RIM E	13.0	13.5	13.0	21.0	25.0	27.0	----	100.0%	77.8%	55.6%
TONOPAH E	12.5	11.5	13.0	25.0	22.7	23.3	23.5	100.0%	76.5%	70.6%

PERSHING

SCHOOL	CLASS SIZE-K	CLASS SIZE G.1	CLASS SIZE G.2	CLASS SIZE G.3	CLASS SIZE G.4	CLASS SIZE G.5	CLASS SIZE G.6	% T'CHRS IN LICENSE	% T'CHRS W/ B.A. ONLY	TCH.EXPER 10YRS.+
PERSHING MIDDLE S	----	----	----	----	----	----	30.0	100.0%	82.3%	44.1%
LOVELOCK E	19.0	14.0	12.0	21.7	24.3	24.6	----	100.0%	89.6%	55.1%

STOREY

SCHOOL	CLASS SIZE-K	CLASS SIZE G.1	CLASS SIZE G.2	CLASS SIZE G.3	CLASS SIZE G.4	CLASS SIZE G.5	CLASS SIZE G.6	% T'CHRS IN LICENSE	% T'CHRS W/ B.A. ONLY	TCH.EXPER 10YRS.+
VIRGINIA CITY MIDDLE	----	----	----	----	----	----	NR	72.0%	71.0%	43.0%
GALLAGHER E	9.0	16.0	15.0	17.0	22.0	32.0	----	100.0%	100.0%	55.0%
HILLSIDE E	6.0	5.5	5.5	7.0	7.0	9.0	9.0	100.0%	75.0%	25.0%

ELEMENTARY CLASSROOMS

WASHOE

SCHOOL	CLASS SIZE-K	CLASS SIZE G.1	CLASS SIZE G.2	CLASS SIZE G.3	CLASS SIZE G.4	CLASS SIZE G.5	CLASS SIZE G.6	% T'CHRS IN LICENSE	% T'CHRS W/ B.A. ONLY	TCH.EXPER 10YRS.+
GERLACH HIGH	----	----	----	----	----	----	NR	75.0%	88.0%	12.0%
INCLINE MIDDLE S	----	----	----	----	----	----	NR	100.0%	65.0%	31.0%
ALLEN E.	30.0	15.5	15.0	27.7	25.0	25.3	30.0	100.0%	66.0%	22.0%
ANDERSON E.	25.3	16.6	13.0	28.0	25.3	30.0	28.0	100.0%	67.0%	41.0%
BECK E.	43.0	15.0	15.3	23.3	23.3	25.3	25.0	100.0%	43.0%	59.0%
BOOTH E.	15.8	14.8	15.6	23.0	26.0	28.0	29.0	100.0%	48.0%	24.0%
BROWN E.	28.0	17.0	14.6	27.7	28.3	28.0	27.0	100.0%	37.0%	34.0%
CANNAN E.	24.3	16.5	17.3	18.9	24.5	23.0	24.0	100.0%	33.0%	25.0%
CORBETT, R. E.	17.2	15.7	18.0	23.0	27.0	28.0	26.0	100.0%	55.0%	28.0%
DIEDRICHSEN E.	26.0	16.8	18.0	20.3	25.7	26.7	30.0	100.0%	58.0%	44.0%
DODSON E.	29.5	15.5	15.8	19.3	24.7	24.3	24.0	100.0%	30.0%	74.0%
DRAKE E.	26.5	13.8	14.2	21.0	24.0	21.6	29.5	100.0%	68.0%	45.0%
DUNCAN E.	18.4	17.0	18.3	29.0	25.3	29.0	32.0	100.0%	54.0%	18.0%
DUNN E.	29.0	14.8	14.8	22.8	26.3	25.3	26.0	100.0%	44.0%	61.0%
ELMCREST E.	22.3	17.4	18.6	27.0	28.0	22.7	28.3	100.0%	44.0%	41.0%
GOMES E.	46.0	14.0	16.8	23.2	27.7	22.4	30.5	100.0%	71.0%	9.0%
GOMM E.	25.5	12.8	15.5	23.3	25.0	21.0	26.3	100.0%	24.0%	9.0%
GREENBRAE E.	27.0	15.0	14.0	21.7	30.4	22.8	25.5	100.0%	50.0%	54.0%
HIDDEN VALLEY E.	25.0	15.9	16.0	25.3	32.7	20.5	26.0	100.0%	35.0%	26.0%
CAUGHLIN RANCH E.	23.0	18.3	27.0	25.0	26.0	22.5	24.5	100.0%	45.0%	14.0%

ELEMENTARY CLASSROOMS

WASHOE (CONT.)

SCHOOL	CLASS SIZE-K	CLASS SIZE G.1	CLASS SIZE G.2	CLASS SIZE G.3	CLASS SIZE G.4	CLASS SIZE G.5	CLASS SIZE G.6	% T'CHRS IN LICENSE	% T'CHRS W/ B.A. ONLY	TCH.EXPER 10YRS.+
HUFFAKER E.	21.3	15.2	16.2	22.0	23.8	32.3	31.3	100.0%	74.0%	29.0%
HUNTER LAKE E.	20.3	20.3	16.7	26.5	21.7	19.3	26.0	100.0%	55.0%	55.0%
INCLINE E.	23.3	12.7	17.0	22.2	25.4	26.5	---	100.0%	60.0%	26.0%
JOHNSON E.	1.0	10.0	6.0	9.0	16.0	16.0	---	100.0%	80.0%	40.0%
JUNIPER E.	22.5	17.8	16.3	22.3	24.3	31.6	28.8	100.0%	32.0%	67.0%
LEMMON VALLEY E.	25.7	16.9	16.9	23.0	32.0	26.0	31.0	100.0%	75.0%	34.0%
LENZ E.	28.0	15.6	15.6	27.0	24.7	19.5	25.0	100.0%	63.0%	20.0%
LINCOLN PARK E.	30.5	17.8	15.3	30.5	28.0	19.0	25.5	100.0%	58.0%	37.0%
LODER E.	24.0	17.7	16.7	20.5	29.2	27.1	26.4	100.0%	55.0%	42.0%
MAXWELL E.	30.0	15.3	15.0	23.7	25.0	26.0	22.0	100.0%	61.0%	40.0%
MITCHELL, R. E.	18.0	17.7	14.0	25.5	25.0	20.5	23.5	100.0%	37.0%	53.0%
MOSS E.	45.3	15.0	18.3	22.3	30.4	25.6	28.5	100.0%	46.0%	37.0%
MOUNT ROSE E.	24.0	16.8	15.3	24.0	16.5	25.0	21.0	100.0%	48.0%	57.0%
NATCHEZ E.	10.0	16.8	13.2	25.0	22.0	21.3	19.0	100.0%	60.0%	33.0%
PALMER E.	25.0	13.4	15.6	24.4	24.0	26.0	24.4	100.0%	84.0%	12.0%
PEAVINE E.	24.0	19.7	16.3	28.5	24.0	23.5	31.0	100.0%	28.0%	59.0%
PLEASANT VALLEY E.	23.5	18.7	14.3	25.0	28.0	23.3	24.7	100.0%	52.0%	50.0%
RISLEY E.	20.8	12.9	14.9	27.3	23.0	27.0	23.0	100.0%	42.0%	33.0%
SIERRA VISTA E.	33.0	11.9	13.1	23.3	22.5	29.5	22.5	100.0%	77.0%	4.0%

ELEMENTARY CLASSROOMS

WASHOE (CONT.)

SCHOOL	CLASS SIZE-K	CLASS SIZE G.1	CLASS SIZE G.2	CLASS SIZE G.3	CLASS SIZE G.4	CLASS SIZE G.5	CLASS SIZE G.6	% T'CHRS IN LICENSE	% T'CHRS W/ B.A. ONLY	TCH.EXPER 10YRS.+
SILVER LAKE E.	18.0	17.4	17.2	24.2	28.3	29.7	25.0	100.0%	72.0%	9.0%
SMITH, A. E.	26.3	15.5	15.7	21.0	27.8	25.0	28.3	100.0%	62.0%	22.0%
SMITH, K. E.	20.5	20.3	12.0	27.5	20.0	24.0	34.0	100.0%	62.0%	14.0%
SMITHRIDGE E.	13.0	18.0	13.8	28.5	25.4	22.3	28.1	100.0%	78.0%	9.0%
STEAD E.	30.0	14.5	13.4	19.3	27.0	31.0	27.0	100.0%	62.0%	12.0%
SUN VALLEY E.	24.5	13.4	14.5	23.0	24.3	27.0	26.0	100.0%	27.0%	60.0%
TAYLOR, A. E.	28.8	16.9	15.9	27.3	24.0	31.0	32.0	100.0%	57.0%	31.0%
TOWLES E.	26.5	14.3	15.5	19.7	21.3	32.5	30.0	100.0%	55.0%	74.0%
VERDI E.	16.5	18.3	15.7	27.0	25.0	21.0	22.5	100.0%	63.0%	31.0%
VETERAN'S E.	24.5	14.0	16.3	29.0	22.5	32.0	26.0	100.0%	32.0%	50.0%
WARNER E.	27.0	14.0	18.0	23.0	24.5	24.0	23.5	100.0%	36.0%	59.0%
WESTERGARD E.	26.0	16.4	16.9	27.3	28.6	27.7	29.0	100.0%	50.0%	26.0%
WHITEHEAD E.	25.0	14.5	13.2	25.0	29.5	29.0	28.0	100.0%	26.0%	74.0%

ELEMENTARY CLASSROOMS

WHITE PINE

SCHOOL	CLASS SIZE-K	CLASS SIZE G.1	CLASS SIZE G.2	CLASS SIZE G.3	CLASS SIZE G.4	CLASS SIZE G.5	CLASS SIZE G.6	% T'CHRS IN LICENSE	% T'CHRS W/ B.A. ONLY	TCH.EXPER 10YRS.+
LUND E	16.0	16.0	14.0	14.0	9.0	27.0	27.0	NR	100.0%	25.0%
MCGILL E	10.9	10.9	10.9	10.9	10.9	10.9	----	100.0%	90.4%	38.5%
MT. VIEW E.	14.0	13.3	13.8	21.5	22.0	23.8	----	100.0%	90.0%	67.0%
WHITE PINE MIDDLE S	----	----	----	----	----	----	21.4	95.8%	91.7%	41.7%

Table C7 – ELEMENTARY STUDENT PARTICIPATION

CARSON

SCHOOL	SPECIAL EDUC.	ENG. AS SECOND LANG'AGE	MIGRANT EDUC.	GIFTED PROG'M	FREE/RE-DUCED LUNCH	AFTER SCHOOL CARE	MUSIC	ARTS	PHYSICAL EDUC.	COMPUTER
BORDEWICH-BRAY E.	17.0%	8.0%	6.1%	3.0%	45.9%	2.8%	100.0%	NR	100.0%	0.0
FREMONT E.	15.3	0.5%	0.5%	6.1%	15.7%	4.8%	100.0%	NR	100.0%	0.0
FRITSCH E.	11.4%	10.55	3.7%	4.6%	24.4%	2.8%	100.0%	NR	100.0%	O.O
SEELIGER E.	12.2%	0.0	0.0	3.2%	17.6%	6.0%	100.0%	NR	100.0%	0.0
TWAIN E.	13.5%	13.7%	2.1%	2.3%	56.4%	2.7%	100.0%	NR	100.0%	0.0
EMPIRE E.	13.4%	13.4%	4.8%	2.2%	39.0%	6.3%	100.0%	NR	100.0%	0.0

CHURCHILL

SCHOOL	SPECIAL EDUC.	ENG. AS SECOND LANG'AGE	MIGRANT EDUC.	GIFTED PROG'M	FREE/RE-DUCED LUNCH	AFTER SCHOOL CARE	MUSIC	ARTS	PHYSICAL EDUC.	COMPUTER
BEST E.	15.0%	2.0%	3.0%	3.0%	41.0%	0.0	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%
LAHONTAN E.	14.0%	1.3%	2.7%	2.1%	38.7%	0.0	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%
NORTHSIDE E.	10.0%	0.0	1.9%	6.6%	31.6%	0.0	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%
WEST END E.	15.2%	0.0	1.1%	4.0%	25.2%	0.0	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

ELEMENTARY STUDENT PARTICIPATION

CLARK

SCHOOL	SPECIAL EDUC.	ENG. AS SECOND LANG'AGE	MIGRANT EDUC.	GIFTED PROG'M	FREE/RE-DUCED LUNCH	AFTER SCHOOL CARE	MUSIC	ARTS	PHYSICAL EDUC.	COMPUTER
LAUGHLIN HIGH/JR	9.7%	1.2%	0.0	1.4%	21.6%	----	17.9%	6.0%	----	----
MOAPA VAL'Y HIGH/JR	7.1%	1.5%	1.7%	4.6%	23.1%	----	51.1%	20.7%	----	----
VIRGIN VAL'Y HIGH/JR	9.2%	3.6%	4.6%	0.0	34.2%	----	32.0%	16.4%	----	----
BROWN JUNIOR HIGH	10.7%	2.2%	0.0	5.4%	38.1%	----	20.8%	0.6%	----	----
CANNON JUNIOR HI	6.2%	0.6%	0.0	14.5%	15.8%	----	30.5%	0.2%	----	----
FREMONT JUNIOR HI	8.9%	14.0%	0.0	6.2%	43.9%	----	21.7%	20.2%	----	----
GREENSPUN JR HIGH	5.2%	0.2%	0.0	13.0%	5.2%	----	37.2%	3.4%	----	----
KNUDSON JUNIOR HI	11.5%	4.9%	0.0	8.3%	41.6%	----	20.7%	3.0%	----	----
SANDY VAL'Y JR HIGH	10.3%	0.0	0.0	0.0	45.6%	----	0.0	0.0	----	----
VON TOBEL JUNIOR H	11.5%	7.6%	0.0	3.0%	66.7%	----	23.2%	18.4%	----	----
BRIDGER MIDDLE SCH	7.9%	6.0%	0.0	2.7%	59.5%	----	27.3%	36.8%%	----	----
BURKHOLDER MID S	8.3%	0.2%	0.0	9.9%	24.5%	----	22.3%	9.7%	----	----
CASHMAN MIDDLE S	9.5%	5.5%	0.0	5.4%	39.1%	----	26.9%	7.3%	----	----
GARRETT MIDDLE S	10.1%	0.2%	0.0	8.1%	14.4%	----	17.6%	46.4%	----	----
GIBSON MIDDLE SCH	11.4%	4.4%	0.0	4.6%	35.1%	----	35.5%	50.8%	----	----
MARTIN MIDDLE SCH	12.6%	19.9%	0.0	1.9%	76.6%	----	13.1%	17.6%	----	----
ORR MIDDLE SCHOOL	8.6%	13.3%	0.0	4.9%	60.5%	----	15.6%	7.8%	----	----
ROBISON MIDDLE S	8.9%	4.2%	0.0	4.8%	44.6%	----	40.6%	47.6%	----	----
SMITH MIDDLE SCH	7.0%	12.8%	0.0	2.2%	64.1%	----	21.7%	1.1%	----	----

ELEMENTARY STUDENT PARTICIPATION

CLARK (CONT.)

SCHOOL	SPECIAL EDUC.	ENG. AS SECOND LANG'AGE	MIGRANT EDUC.	GIFTED PROG'M	FREE/RE-DUCED LUNCH	AFTER SCHOOL CARE	MUSIC	ARTS	PHYSICAL EDUC.	COMPUTER
SWAINSTON MID SCH	10.2%	1.4%	0.0	4.6%	37.3%	----	32.0%	8.5%%	----	----
WHITE MIDDLE SCH	6.8%	0.4%	0.0	13.0%	14.4%	----	31.4%	5.6%	----	----
WOODBURY MIDDLE	8.2%	1.4%	0.0	11.2%	20.5%	----	34.2%	9.3%	----	----
CARSON 6TH	8.9%	3.7%	0.0	9.6%	33.3%	NR	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%
GILBERT 6TH	7.6%	1.1%	0.0	13.5%	20.1%	NR	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%
HOGGARD 6TH	11.1%	1.2%	0.0	11.9%	34.5%	NR	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%
KELLY 6TH	8.4%	2.2%	0.0	10.8%	38.0%	NR	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%
MACKEY 6TH	9.5%	3.4%	0.0	11.0%	35.9%	NR	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%
MADISON 6TH	11.9%	2.5%	0.0	9.7%	44.3%	NR	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%
MCCALL 6TH	5.6%	11.6%	0.0	6.6%	28.5%	NR	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%
ADAMS E	11.2%	8.1%	0.0	7.0%	31.3%	NR	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%
ADCOCK E.	11.7%	0.9%	0.0	7.6%	30.7%	NR	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%
ANTONELLO E.	8.5%	0.0	0.0	10.7%	22.9%	NR	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%
BARTLETT E.	8.9%	6.5%	0.0	12.5%	6.7%	NR	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%
BEATTY E.	9.7%	1.9%	0.0	10.5%	14.7%	NR	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%
BECKLEY E.	11.5%	6.2%	0.0	13.0%	37.7%	NR	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%
BELL E.	9.6%	16.6%	0.0	1.8%	64.8%	NR	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%
BENDORF E.	9.4%	9.0%	0.0	15.5%	18.1%	NR	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%
BENNETT E.	13.6%	2.9%	0.0	1.6%	34.4%	NR	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

ELEMENTARY STUDENT PARTICIPATION

CLARK (CONT.)

SCHOOL	SPECIAL EDUC.	ENG. AS SECOND LANG'AGE	MIGRANT EDUC.	GIFTED PROG'M	FREE/RE-DUCED LUNCH	AFTER SCHOOL CARE	MUSIC	ARTS	PHYSICAL EDUC.	COMPUTER
BOWLER E.	11.0%	3.4%	0.0	2.2%	26.4%	NR	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%
BRACKEN E.	10.0%	22.9%	0.0	0.3%	75.7%	NR	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%
CAHLAN E.	19.6%	22.6%	0.0	0.4%	77.6%	NR	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%
CHRISTENSEN E.	5.8%	1.9%	0.0	16.0%	4.6%	NR	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%
COX, C. E.	16.6%	4.8%	0.0	2.7%	47.6%	NR	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%
COX, D. E.	6.3%	0.6%	0.0	11.1%	7.7%	NR	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%
CRAIG E.	10.4%	11.4%	0.0	2.5%	77.5%	NR	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%
CRESTWOOD E.	20.5%	10.1%	0.0	5.3%	49.1%	NR	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%
CULLEY E.	7.2%	3.9%	0.0	8.1%	30.6%	NR	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%
CUNNINGHAM E.	11.5%	3.3%	0.0	11.4%	41.6%	NR	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%
DAILEY E.	8.7%	18.5%	0.0	9.0%	61.4	NR	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%
DEARING E.	5.1%	5.4%	0.0%	11.6%	43.5%	NR	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%
DECKER E.	10.2%	3.8%	0.0	14.3%	19.8%	NR	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%
DERFELT E.	11.1%	0.6%	0.0	11.0%	16.8%	NR	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%
DESKIN E.	9.8%	10.%	0.0	14.1%	15.8%	NR	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%
DISKEN E.	7.4%	5.7%	0.0	5.4%	32.9%	NR	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%
DONDERO E.	8.2%	2.3%	0.0	11.3%	24.5%	NR	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%
DOOLEY E.	12.9%	0.2%	0.0	11.1%	12.9%	NR	100.0	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%
EARL, I. E.	8.9%	6.3%	0.0	1.8%	37.6%	NR	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

ELEMENTARY STUDENT PARTICIPATION

CLARK (CONT.)

SCHOOL	SPECIAL EDUC.	ENG. AS SECOND LANG'AGE	MIGRANT EDUC.	GIFTED PROG'M	FREE/RE-DUCED LUNCH	AFTER SCHOOL CARE	MUSIC	ARTS	PHYSICAL EDUC.	COMPUTER
EARL, M. E.	9.4%	1.7%	0.0	17.0%	13.6%	NR	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%
EDWARDS E.	12.2%	9.7%	0.0	6.3%	28.5%	NR	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%
EISENBERG-KA E.	8.7%	0.5%	0.0	13.2%	11.8%	NR	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%
FERRPM E.	17.0%	10.4%	0.0	10.2%	38.8%	NR	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%
FONG E.	6.7%	0.4%	0.0	9.7%	32.2%	NR	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%
FRENCH E.	10.0%	0.6%	0.0	11.1%	14.7%	NR	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%
FYFE E.	12.0%	0.4%	0.0	1.1%	34.9%	NR	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%
GALLOWAY E.	10.1%	0.1%	0.0	9.2%	11.2%	NR	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%
GIBSON E.	7.7%	0.2%	0.0	6.7%	2.7%	NR	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%
GRAGSON E.	13.3%	8.3%	0.0	4.7%	48.5%	NR	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%
GRAY E.	11.2%	12.9%	0.0	11.6%	24.4%	NR	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%
GRIFFITH	25.7%	9.3%	0.0	4.6%	50.0%	NR	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%
HANCOCK E.	6.8%	0.2%	0.0	9.5%	23.5%	NR	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%
HARMON E.	10.5%	6.6%	0.0	8.9%	32.9%	NR	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%
HARRIS E.	7.9%	1.1%	0.0	13.0%	16.5%	NR	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%
HEARD E.	10.9%	0.7%	0.0	5.7%	31.2%	NR	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%
HERR E.	9.3%	1.9%	0.0	8.1%	45.1%	NR	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%
HERRON E.	7.6%	30.4%	0.0	1.5%	75.4%	NR	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%
HEWESTON E.	8.8%	29.5%	0.0	1.9%	62.2%	NR	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

ELEMENTARY STUDENT PARTICIPATION

CLARK (CONT.)

SCHOOL	SPECIAL EDUC.	ENG. AS SECOND LANG'AGE	MIGRANT EDUC.	GIFTED PROG'M	FREE/RE-DUCED LUNCH	AFTER SCHOOL CARE	MUSIC	ARTS	PHYSICAL EDUC.	COMPUTER
HILL E.	7.3%	0.6%	0.0	11.2%	9.0%	NR	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%
HINMAN E.	11.6%	0.7%	0.0	2.0%	43.1%	NR	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%
INDIAN SPRIN E.	12.5%	0.0	0.0	0.6%	36.4%	NR	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%
JACOBSON E.	9.3%	0.4%	0.0	7.4%	11.3%	NR	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%
JYDSTRUP E.	5.2%	2.9%	0.0	4.1%	42.9%	NR	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%
KATZ-MCMILLAN E.	11.9%	1.2%	0.0	10.8%	17.5%	NR	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%
KIM E.	8.4%	4.1%	0.0	11.3%	11.3%	NR	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%
KING, M.L. E.	18.6%	9.0%	0.0	5.7%	60.1%	NR	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%
KING, M.P. E	11.9%	0.6%	0.0	11.7%	19.5%	NR	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%
LAKE E.	13.6%	16.2%	0.0	7.6%	52.6%	NR	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%
LINCOLN E.	13.5%	14.2%	0.0	5.0%	68.7%	NR	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%
LONG E.	6.5%	5.3%	0.0	11.6%	26.0%	NR	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%
LUNT E.	9.8%	26.8%	0.0	0.3%	86.0%	NR	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%
LYNCH E.	8.5%	5.7%	0.0	1.3%	63.8%	NR	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%
MACK E.	7.8%	0.3%	0.0	12.6%	12.0%	NR	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%
MANCH E.	9.9%	8.1%	0.0	4.7%	65.3%	NR	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%
MAY E.	10.0%	0.1%	0.0	9.1%	20.0%	NR	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%
MCCAW E.	12.2%	0.4%	0.0	10.0%	30.0%	NR	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%
MCDONIEL E.	7.9%	0.9%	0.0	13.2%	6.3%	NR	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

ELEMENTARY STUDENT PARTICIPATION

CLARK (CONT.)

SCHOOL	SPECIAL EDUC.	ENG. AS SECOND LANG'AGE	MIGRANT EDUC.	GIFTED PROG'M	FREE/RE-DUCED LUNCH	AFTER SCHOOL CARE	MUSIC	ARTS	PHYSICAL EDUC.	COMPUTER
MCWILLIAMS E.	17.9%	1.9%	0.0	8.8%	32.0%	NR	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%
MENDOZA E.	7.2%	2.3%	0.0	7.3%	19.4%	NR	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%
MITCHELL E.	14.6%	0.0	0.0	3.0%	14.4%	NR	100.0%	100.0%	100.0	100.0%
MOUNTAIN VIEW E.	14.0%	3.4%	0.0	7.5%	30.9%	NR	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%
PARADISE E.	13.4%	14.6%	0.0	5.5%	52.9%	NR	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%
PARK E.	12.6%	38.7%	0.0	5.4%	70.7%	NR	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%
PARSON E.	8.9%	3.6%	0.0	10.2%	23.2%	NR	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%
PERKINS E.	26.0%	13.7%	0.0	5.5%	54.3%	NR	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%
PITTMAN E.	14.3%	0.4%	0.0	8.4%	36.1%	NR	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%
RED ROCK E.	19.3%	1.5%	0.0	8.4%	37.2%	NR	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%
REED E.	12.0%	0.8%	0.0	13.5%	23.3%	NR	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%
RONNOW E	8.7%	12.4%	0.0	5.5%	47.7%	NR	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%
RONZONE E.	8.1%	1.1%	0.0	3.8%	34.8%	NR	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%
ROWE E.	13.2%	7.4%	0.0	7.7%	47.1%	NR	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%
RUNDLE E.	10.2%	5.7%	0.0	9.0%	31.8%	NR	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%
SANDY VALLEY E.	17.9%	1.8%	0.0	0.9%	54.5%	NR	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%
SEWELL E.	9.6%	0.1%	0.0	7.0%	39.7%	NR	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%
SMITH, H. E.	11.9%	0.4%	0.0	7.7%	23.8%	NR	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%
SQUIRES E.	9.5%	23.3%	0.0	1.8%	77.1%	NR	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

ELEMENTARY STUDENT PARTICIPATION

CLARK (CONT.)

SCHOOL	SPECIAL EDUC.	ENG. AS SECOND LANG'AGE	MIGRANT EDUC.	GIFTED PROG'M	FREE/RE-DUCED LUNCH	AFTER SCHOOL CARE	MUSIC	ARTS	PHYSICAL EDUC.	COMPUTER
STANFORD E.	9.5%	4.8%	0.0	7.5%	19.4%	NR	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%
SUNRISE ACRE E.	9.3%	38.2%	0.0	0.0	85.5%	NR	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%
TATE E.	9.3%	2.6%	0.0	4.1%	50.0%	NR	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%
TAYLOR, R. E.	12.8%	5.4%	0.0	0.2%	69.9%	NR	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%
THOMAS E.	14.3%	12.7%	0.0	2.7%	63.5%	NR	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%
THORPE E.	12.0%	1.5%	0.0	1.6%	15.7%	NR	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%
TOBLER E.	16.3%	0.2%	0.0	10.7%	13.6%	NR	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%
TOMIYASU E.	8.4%	2.6%	0.0	15.3%	20.7%	NR	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%
TREEM E.	12.0%	0.7	0.0	17.5%	21.1%	NR	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.05
TWIN LAKES E.	10.3%	9.6%	0.0	11.3%	56.4%	NR	100.05	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%
ULLOM E.	14.5%	5.3%	0.0	6.9%	43.2%	NR	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%
VEGAS VERDES E.	7.6%	5.7%	0.0	6.1%	33.4%	NR	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%
VIRGIN VALLEY E.	12.3%	8.5%	0.0	0.2%	45.2%	NR	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%
WARD E.	8.0%	28.6%	0.0	1.1%	60.0%	NR	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%
WARREN E.	7.8%	6.8%	0.0	2.4%	34.7%	NR	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%
WASDEN E.	17.3%	3.2%	0.0	12.8%	31.5%	NR	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%
WENGERT E.	17.6%	2.8%	0.0	11.8%	27.4%	NR	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%
WHITNEY E.	18.8%	3.7%	0.0	3.7%	39.2%	NR	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%
WILLIAMS E.	13.4%	14.5%	0.0	0.9%	53.6%	NR	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

ELEMENTARY STUDENT PARTICIPATION

CLARK (CONT.)

SCHOOL	SPECIAL EDUC.	ENG. AS SECOND LANG'AGE	MIGRANT EDUC.	GIFTED PROG'M	FREE/RE-DUCED LUNCH	AFTER SCHOOL CARE	MUSIC	ARTS	PHYSICAL EDUC.	COMPUTER
WOOLLEY E.	9.8%	5.2%	0.0	5.0%	57.0%	NR	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%
WYNN E.	10.3%	5.0%	0.0	8.2%	35.9%	NR	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%
WASDEN JUNIOR HI	17.3%	3.2%	0.0	12.8%	31.5%	---	0.0	0.0	---	---
BOOKER 6TH	6.7%	1.4%	0.0	10.7%	26.0%	NR	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

DOUGLAS

SCHOOL	SPECIAL EDUC.	ENG. AS SECOND LANG'AGE	MIGRANT EDUC.	GIFTED PROG'M	FREE/RE-DUCED LUNCH	AFTER SCHOOL CARE	MUSIC	ARTS	PHYSICAL EDUC.	COMPUTER
KINGSBURY MIDDLE	3.1%	4.9%	0.0	4.2%	7.2%	1.1%	91.9%	66.0%	100.0%	100.0%
GARDNERVILLE E.	12.0%	3.5%	0.0	5.1%	19.3%	0.0	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%
JACKS VALLEY E.	13.5%	3.1%	0.0	4.9%	20.3%	0.0	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%
MENELEY E.	14.7%	1.2%	0.0	2.3%	32.9%	0.0	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%
SCARSELLI E.	10.0%	1.0%	0.0	5.0%	20.0%	0.0	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%
ZEPHYR COVE E.	9.7%	15.8%	0.0	3.3%	23.3%	20.8%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

ELEMENTARY STUDENT PARTICIPATION

ELKO

SCHOOL	SPECIAL EDUC.	ENG. AS SECOND LANG'AGE	MIGRANT EDUC.	GIFTED PROG'M	FREE/RE-DUCED LUNCH	AFTER SCHOOL CARE	MUSIC	ARTS	PHYSICAL EDUC.	COMPUTER
CARLIN COMPLETE	10.1%	0.0	0.0	1.2%	11.5%	0.0	70.5%	68.5%	50.0%	0.0
JACKPOT COMP.S	11.0%	27.0%	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	50.0%	78.0%	50.0%	0.0
OWYHEE COMP. S	12.8%	0.0	0.0	0.6%	77.5%	0.0	77.5%	72.5%	50.0%	0.0
WELL COMPLETE S	14.7%	0.0	0.0	0.0	26.8	0.0	61.0%	74.0%	50.0%	100.0%
ELKO GRAMMAR2 E	9.6%	0.0	0.0	3.4%	20.4%	0.0	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	0.0
MT. VIEW E	8.6%	0.0	0.0	2.3%	7.9%	0.0	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	0.0
NORTHSIDE E	12.8%	0.0	0.0	3.9%	14.7%	0.0	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	0.0
RURALS E	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	0.0
SAGE E	11.2%	0.0	0.0	1.1%	13.0%	0.0	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	0.0
SOUTHSIDE E	8.5%	19.0%	0.0	1.0	28.7%	0.0	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	0.0
SPRING CREEK E	8.8%	0.0	0.0	3.4%	5.4%	0.0	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	0.0
WEST WENDOVER E	8.1%	33.8%	0.0	1.4%	50.5%	0.0	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	0.0

ESMERALDA

SCHOOL	SPECIAL EDUC.	ENG. AS SECOND LANG'AGE	MIGRANT EDUC.	GIFTED PROG'M	FREE/RE-DUCED LUNCH	AFTER SCHOOL CARE	MUSIC	ARTS	PHYSICAL EDUC.	COMPUTER
ALL	14.0%	NR	9.0%	NR	54.0%	NR	80.0%	100.0%	100.0%	80.0%

ELEMENTARY STUDENT PARTICIPATION

EUREKA

SCHOOL	SPECIAL EDUC.	ENG. AS SECOND LANG'AGE	MIGRANT EDUC.	GIFTED PROG'M	FREE/RE-DUCED LUNCH	AFTER SCHOOL CARE	MUSIC	ARTS	PHYSICAL EDUC.	COMPUTER
EUREKA E	20.1%	NR	NR	9.0%	34.0%	NR	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%
BEOWAWE E	2.2%	0.0	0.0	17.7%	26.7%	0.0	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	0.0

HUMBOLDT

SCHOOL	SPECIAL EDUC.	ENG. AS SECOND LANG'AGE	MIGRANT EDUC.	GIFTED PROG'M	FREE/RE-DUCED LUNCH	AFTER SCHOOL CARE	MUSIC	ARTS	PHYSICAL EDUC.	COMPUTER
MCDERMITT COMP S	4.5%	12.5%	0.0	0.0	50.7%	NR	100.0%	100.0%	92.0%	95.0%
WINNEMUCCA JR. H	12.2%	3.6%	0.0	0.1%	18.5%	----	22.9%	50.0%	0.0%	----
GRASS VALLEY E	7.0%	0.0	2.0%	6.0%	23.0%	NR	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%
RURALS E.	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0%	0.0	0.0
SONOMA HEIGHT E	7.0%	0.0	3.0%	17.0%	17.0%	NR	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%
WINNEMUCCH GR' E	11.0%	0.0	9.0%	12.0%	29.8%	NR	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

ELEMENTARY STUDENT PARTICIPATION

LANDER

SCHOOL	SPECIAL EDUC.	ENG. AS SECOND LANG'AGE	MIGRANT EDUC.	GIFTED PROG'M	FREE/RE-DUCED LUNCH	AFTER SCHOOL CARE	MUSIC	ARTS	PHYSICAL EDUC.	COMPUTER
BATTLE MT. JR.H	11.0%	0.0	1.9%	0.0	12.3%	0.0	29.6%	0.0	33.3%	70.0%
AUSTIN E	7.8%	0.0	2.8%	0.0	26.7%	0.0	26.8%	100.0%	100.0%	86.0%
BLACK/PIERCE E	6.2%	0.0	7.0%	0.2%	17.7%	0.0	98.7%	98.7%	98.7%	0.0

LINCOLN

SCHOOL	SPECIAL EDUC.	ENG. AS SECOND LANG'AGE	MIGRANT EDUC.	GIFTED PROG'M	FREE/RE-DUCED LUNCH	AFTER SCHOOL CARE	MUSIC	ARTS	PHYSICAL EDUC.	COMPUTER
CALIENTE E	10.0%	0.0	0.0	0.0	60.2%	17.0%	0.0	100.0%	100.0%	78.0%
PAHRANAGAT E	16.0%	0.0	0.0	0.0	44.0%	0.0	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	28.0%
PANACA E	11.0%	0.0	0.0	0.0	44.8%	0.0	0.0	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%
PIOCHE E	11.0%	0.0	0.0	0.0	22.0%	0.0	0.0	100.0%	100.0%	59.0%

ELEMENTARY STUDENT PARTICIPATION

LYON

SCHOOL	SPECIAL EDUC.	ENG. AS SECOND LANG'AGE	MIGRANT EDUC.	GIFTED PROG'M	FREE/RE-DUCED LUNCH	AFTER SCHOOL CARE	MUSIC	ARTS	PHYSICAL EDUC.	COMPUTER
SMITH VAL'Y COMP S	15.1%	8.1%	0.0	7.8%	28.9%	NR	50.0%	50.0%	100.0%	100.0
DAYTON INTERMED S	16.2%	0.0	0.0	3.2%	37.0%	NR	58.3%	50.0%	100.0%	0.0
FERNLEY INTERMED S	11.1%	2.8%	0.0	5.2%	31.4%	NR	50.0%	50.0%	100.0%	50.2%
YERINGTON INTERM S	12.7%	0.0	9.5%	3.9%	44.4%	NR	59.3%	50.0%	100.0%	0.0
COTTONWOOD E	22.1%	3.1%	0.0	1.0%	26.2%	NR	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%
DAYTON E	13.4%	0.0	0.0	2.5%	34.1%	NR	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%
FERNLEY E	14.6%	4.0%	0.0	0.9%	33.4%	NR	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%
SILVER SPRINGS E	18.3%	0.0	0.0	0.4%	43.6%	NR	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%
YERINGTON E	11.0%	0.0	5.7%	1.3%	41.8%	NR	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

MINERAL

SCHOOL	SPECIAL EDUC.	ENG. AS SECOND LANG'AGE	MIGRANT EDUC.	GIFTED PROG'M	FREE/RE-DUCED LUNCH	AFTER SCHOOL CARE	MUSIC	ARTS	PHYSICAL EDUC.	COMPUTER
HAWTHORNE ENR	NR	NR	NR	NR	NR	NR	NR	NR	NR	NR
SCHURZ E	NR	NR	NR	NR	NR	NR	NR	NR	NR	NR

ELEMENTARY STUDENT PARTICIPATION

NYE

SCHOOL	SPECIAL EDUC.	ENG. AS SECOND LANG'AGE	MIGRANT EDUC.	GIFTED PROG'M	FREE/RE-DUCED LUNCH	AFTER SCHOOL CARE	MUSIC	ARTS	PHYSICAL EDUC.	COMPUTER
PAHRUMP 5/6T	6.5%	0.0	2.2%	0.0%	32.7%	0.0	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	0.0
ARMAGOSA VALLEY E	13.3%	0.0	12.6%	0.0	71.3%	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
BEATTY E	5.8%	0.0	0.0	0.0	18.8%	4.5%	11.7%	0.0	11.7%	0.0
GABBS E	8.3%	0.0	0.0	0.0	37.0%	0.0	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%
PAHRUMP INTERM S	9.3%	0.0	2.3%	0.0	53.4%	14.5%	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
PAHRUMP PRIMARY	8.5%	0.0	3.7%	0.0	32.1%	0.0	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	0.0
ROUND MT. E	11.8%	0.0	0.0	6.1%	4.5%	0.0	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%
SILVER RIM E	16.9%	0.0	0.0	0.0	24.7%	0.0	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	96.4%
TONOPAH E	11.0%	0.0	0.0	0.0	42.1%	0.0	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

PERSHING

SCHOOL	SPECIAL EDUC.	ENG. AS SECOND LANG'AGE	MIGRANT EDUC.	GIFTED PROG'M	FREE/RE-DUCED LUNCH	AFTER SCHOOL CARE	MUSIC	ARTS	PHYSICAL EDUC.	COMPUTER
PERSHING MIDDLE S	20.1%	0.0	3.7%	0.0	22.9%	0.0	16.5%	25.0%	100.0%	0.0
LOVELOCK E	24.0%	0.0	23.8%	0.4%	28.8%	0.0	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

ELEMENTARY STUDENT PARTICIPATION

STOREY

SCHOOL	SPECIAL EDUC.	ENG. AS SECOND LANG'AGE	MIGRANT EDUC.	GIFTED PROG'M	FREE/RE-DUCED LUNCH	AFTER SCHOOL CARE	MUSIC	ARTS	PHYSICAL EDUC.	COMPUTER
VIRGINIA CITY MIDDLE	15.0%	0.0	0.0	11.0%	19.0%	0.0	35.0%	22.0%	100.0%	66.0%
GALLAGHER E	16.0%	0.0	0.0	0.0	26.0%	10.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	0.0
HILLSIDE E	22.0%	0.0	0.0	0.0	28.0%	0.0	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	0.0

ELEMENTARY STUDENT PARTICIPATION

WASHOE

SCHOOL	SPECIAL EDUC.	ENG. AS SECOND LANG'AGE	MIGRANT EDUC.	GIFTED PROG'M	FREE/RE-DUCED LUNCH	AFTER SCHOOL CARE	MUSIC	ARTS	PHYSICAL EDUC.	COMPUTER
GERLACH HIGH	2.7%	0.0	0.0	0.0	43.2%	---	18.0%	15.0%	---	---
INCLINE MIDDLE S	14.0%	14.0%	0.0	19.0%	9.0%	---	42.0%	59.3%	---	---
ALLEN E.	12.8%	0.0	0.0	2.0	53.7%	4.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%
ANDERSON E.	10.5%	10.5%	3.1%	3.5%	69.1%	2.5%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%
BECK E.	3.3%	0.0	0.0	11.3%	3.3%	0.0	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%
BOOTH E.	4.4%	31.5%	7.7%	2.5%	69.2%	3.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%
BROWN E.	8.3%	0.0	0.0	6.4%	11.6%	6.9%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%
CANNAN E.	6.7%	10.0%	1.3%	2.3%	56.3%	5.7%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%
CORBETT, R. E.	9.7%	20.6%	2.2%	0.8%	73.8%	0.0	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%
DIEDRICHSEN E.	4.1%	0.0	0.0	7.7%	3.8%	11.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%
DODSON E.	5.3%	0.0	0.0	8.5%	10.5%	9.3%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%
DRAKE E.	8.2%	0.0	0.0	3.3%	23.5%	0.0	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%
DUNCAN E.	8.2%	32.4%	4.4%	1.4%	79.0%	3.5%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%
DUNN E.	7.2%	0.0	0.0	5.1%	11.6%	6.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%
ELMCREST E.	6.5%	7.6%	0.5%	4.0%	28.5%	4.9%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%
GOMES E.	11.8%	0.0	0.0	2.6%	24.3%	8.3%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%
GOMM E.	9.6%	0.0	0.0	12.1%	3.6%	0.0	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%
GREENBRAE E.	7.9%	5.1%	1.3%	4.2%	28.6%	0.0	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%
HIDDEN VALLEY E.	19.5%	0.0	0.0	4.35	15.8%	9.4%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%
CAUGHLIN RANCH	22.0%	0.0	0.0	7.9%	13.8%	10.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

ELEMENTARY STUDENT PARTICIPATION

WASHOE (CONT.)

SCHOOL	SPECIAL EDUC.	ENG. AS SECOND LANG'AGE	MIGRANT EDUC.	GIFTED PROG'M	FREE/RE-DUCED LUNCH	AFTER SCHOOL CARE	MUSIC	ARTS	PHYSICAL EDUC.	COMPUTER
HUFFAKER E.	2.4%	0.0	0.0	11.8%	2.8%	7.9%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%
HUNTER LAKE E.	5.8%	3.0%	0.5%	8.4%	17.1%	9.3%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%
INCLINE E.	12.1%	10.0%	0.0	12.9%	10.0%	3.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%
JOHNSON E.	3.8%	0.0	0.0	0.0	20.4%	0.0	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%
JUNIPER E.	5.7%	0.0	0.0	4.7%	14.3%	10.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%
LEMMON VALLEY E.	7.2%	0.0	0.0	1.7%	25.5%	4.3%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%
LENZ E.	3.3%	0.0	0.0	5.4%	4.9%	7.7%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%
LINCOLN PARK E.	16.2%	0.0	0.0	1.8%	41.1%	4.3%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%
LODER E.	7.3%	29.1%	9.6%	3.3%	72.3%	7.6%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%
MAXWELL E.	17.2%	0.0	0.0	3.5%	20.8%	6.1%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%
MITCHELL, R. E.	9.7%	12.9%	2.8%	2.6%	51.7%	0.0	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%
MOSS E.	12.7%	0.0	0.0	6.4%	9.8%	12.1%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%
MOUNT ROSE E.	7.7%	8.3%	1.4%	4.9%	33.7%	5.1%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%
NATCHEZ E.	10.5%	0.0	0.0	1.7%	80.2%	0.0	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%
PALMER E.	7.7%	5.5%	0.0	1.3%	51.4%	5.9%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%
PEAVINE E.	10.4%	0.0	0.0	7.7%	16.3%	0.0	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%
PLEASANT VALLEY E.	9.2%	0.0	0.0	4.85	12.4%	4.6%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%
RISLEY E.	10.4%	9.2%	1.3%	3.3%	44.9%	3.6%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%
SIERRA VISTA E.	3.3%	14.8%	4.1%	19.0%	54.8%	2.5%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

ELEMENTARY STUDENT PARTICIPATION

WASHOE (CONT.)

SCHOOL	SPECIAL EDUC.	ENG. AS SECOND LANG'AGE	MIGRANT EDUC.	GIFTED PROG'M	FREE/RE-DUCED LUNCH	AFTER SCHOOL CARE	MUSIC	ARTS	PHYSICAL EDUC.	COMPUTER
SILVER LAKE E.	9.1%	0.0	0.0	3.2%	25.9%	2.5%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%
SMITH, A. E.	16.8%	5.8%	2.0%	2.3%	43.2%	4.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%
SMITH, K. E.	6.8%	10.4%	2.6%	0.6%	57.4%	0.0	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%
SMITHRIDGE E.	8.6%	17.1%	2.4%	2.3%	48.9%	3.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%
STEAD E.	8.3%	0.0	0.0	1.6%	45.5%	5.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%
SUN VALLEY E.	11.3%	9.3%	1.3%	1.6%	44.3%	0.0	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%
TAYLOR, A. E.	5.8%	0.0	0.1%	3.5%	15.6%	6.1%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%
TOWLES E.	7.7%	0.0	0.0	6.1%	14.2%	0.0	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%
VERDI E.	8.0%	0.0	0.0	12.8%	3.1%	6.7%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%
VETERAN'S E.	8.3%	19.4%	4.5%	3.8%	51.7%	0.0	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%
WARNER E.	10.3%	8.4%	1.2%	2.0%	32.9%	7.1%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%
WESTERGARD E.	3.9%	0.0	0.0	6.9%	4.4%	5.7%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%
WHITEHEAD E.	5.5%	0.0	0.0	4.8%	5.0%	11.2%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

ELEMENTARY STUDENT PARTICIPATION

WHITE PINE

SCHOOL	SPECIAL EDUC.	ENG. AS SECOND LANG'AGE	MIGRANT EDUC.	GIFTED PROG'M	FREE/RE-DUCED LUNCH	AFTER SCHOOL CARE	MUSIC	ARTS	PHYSICAL EDUC.	COMPUTER
LUND E	10.0%	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	100.0%	100.0%	NR	NR
MCGILL E	12.5%	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	0.0
MT. VIEW E.	9.0%	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	100.0%	100.0%	77.0%	NR
WHITE PINE MIDDLE S	8.3%	NR	NR	NR	0.0	----	49.2%	50.9%	100.0%	37.4%

Table C8 -- ELEMENTARY STUDENT PERFORMANCE

CARSON

	NATIONAL PERCENTILE RANK OF AVE.SCORE						PERCENT OF 6TH GRADERS COMPETENT			
SCHOOL	READ GR.3	MATH GR.3	LANG GR.3	READ GR.6	MATH GR.6	LANG GR.6	WRITING IDEAS	WRITING ORGANIZ.	WRITING VOICE	WRITING CONVENT'N
BORDEWICH/BRAY E.	36%	34%	34%	35%	36%	44%	49.2%	44.6%	63.1%	53.8%
FREMONT E.	65%	61%	56%	60%	51%	53%	71.1%	66.3%	69.9%	59.0%
FRITSCH E.	45%	49%	46%	54%	54%	58%	66.2%	61.0%	72.7%	75.3%
SEELIGER E.	50%	36%	39%	56%	53%	58%	62.7%	61.8%	75.5%	62.7%
TWAIN E.	37%	28%	30%	30%	24%	31%	54.9%	47.1%	62.7%	60.8%
EMPIRE E.	31%	27%	24%	50%	49%	51%	66.3%	58.1%	70.9%	65.1%

CHURCHILL

	NATIONAL PERCENTILE RANK OF AVE.SCORE						PERCENT OF 6TH GRADERS COMPETENT			
SCHOOL	READ GR.3	MATH GR.3	LANG GR.3	READ GR.6	MATH GR.6	LANG GR.6	WRITING IDEAS	WRITING ORGANIZ.	WRITING VOICE	WRITING CONVENT'N
BEST E.	54%	43%	48%	50%	48%	48%	NR	NR	NR	NR
LAHONTAN E.	59%	50%	47%	57%	45%	53%	NR	NR	NR	NR
NORTHSIDE	64%	59%	52%	56%	54%	62%	NR	NR	NR	NR
WEST END E.	67%	47%	54%	70%	68%	58%	NR	NR	NR	NR

ELEMENTARY STUDENT PERFORMANCE

CLARK

	NATIONAL PERCENTILE RANK OF AVE.SCORE						PERCENT OF 6TH GRADERS COMPETENT			
SCHOOL	READ GR.3	MATH GR.3	LANG GR.3	READ GR.6	MATH GR.6	LANG GR.6	WRITING IDEAS	WRITING ORGANIZ.	WRITING VOICE	WRITING CONVENT'N
LAUGHLIN H. JH.	---	---	---	34%	40%	35%	---	---	---	---
MOAPA VALLEY H. JH.	---	---	---	56%	69%	54%	---	---	---	---
VIRGIN VALLEY H. JH.	---	---	---	45%	40%	22%	---	---	---	---
BROWN JH.	---	---	---	43%	52%	48%	54.9%	46.9%	67.4%	57.5%
CANNON JH.	---	---	---	59%	70%	63%	57.1%	51.5%	63.3%	62.3%
FREMONT JH.	---	---	---	53%	69%	52%	54.2%	53.3%	61.2%	57.5%
GREENSPUN JH.	---	---	---	66%	73%	72%	72.4%	67.1%	74.7%	75.5%
KNUDSON JH.	---	---	---	43%	61%	37%	49.2%	43.2%	48.5%	52.3%
SANDY VALLEY JH.	---	---	---	59%	73%	58%	50.0%	55.6%	66.7%	72.2%
VON TOBEL JH.	---	---	---	37%	41%	38%	43.2%	38.9%	52.8%	45.9%
BRIDGER MIDDLE S.	---	---	---	29%	50%	36%	49.1%	40.4%	57.0%	55.2%
BURKHOLDER MIDDLE S.	---	---	---	58%	63%	58%	53.4%	48.2%	55.8%	56.1%
CASHMAN MIDDLE S.	---	---	---	36%	56%	42%	44.8%	45.8%	57.3%	47.9%
GARRETT MIDDLE S.	---	---	---	65%	77%	63%	56.9%	50.3%	58.5%	57.4%
GIBSON MIDDLE S.	---	---	---	55%	63%	48%	51.2%	46.0%	60.3%	57.5%
MARTIN MIDDLE S.	---	---	---	30%	48%	31%	44.4%	42.8%	50.3%	42.2%
ORR MIDDLE S.	---	---	---	43%	56%	42%	48.6%	45.8%	57.0%	49.3%
ROBISON MIDDLE S.	---	---	---	41%	56%	42%	41.7%	39.1%	52.5%	51.4%
SMITH MIDDLE S.	---	---	---	30%	35%	34%	39.5%	33.0%	49.0%	35.0%
SWAINSTON MIDDLE S.	---	---	---	37%	46%	37%	34.4%	32.4%	51.9%	43.2%

ELEMENTARY STUDENT PERFORMANCE

CLARK (CONT.)

	NATIONAL PERCENTILE RANK OF AVE.SCORE						PERCENT OF 6TH GRADERS COMPETENT			
SCHOOL	READ GR.3	MATH GR.3	LANG GR.3	READ GR.6	MATH GR.6	LANG GR.6	WRITING IDEAS	WRITING ORGANIZ.	WRITING VOICE	WRITING CONVENT'N
WHITE MIDDLE S.	----	----	----	63%	81%	67%	63.7%	58.0%	65.6%	66.7%
CARSON 6TH	----	----	----	46%	69%	52%	51.3%	48.7%	56.1%	54.0%
GILBERT 6TH	----	----	----	59%	73%	61%	NR	NR	NR	NR
HOGGARD 6TH	----	----	----	NR	NR	NR	NR	NR	NR	NR
KELLY 6TH	----	----	----	51%	66%	58%	52.6%	45.7%	56.0%	54.0%
MACKEY 6TH	----	----	----	51%	69%	54%	54.0%	50.6%	61.6%	60.6%
MADISON 6TH	----	----	----	49%	69%	50%	59.9%	57.2%	66.7%	65.4%
MCCALL 6TH	----	----	----	59%	73%	58%	53.0%	49.5%	57.7%	60.4%
ADAMS E.	61%	59%	63%	----	----	----	----	----	----	----
ADCOCK E.	69%	65%	66%	----	----	----	----	----	----	----
ANTONELLO E.	56%	59%	54%	----	----	----	----	----	----	----
BARTLETTE E.	72%	73%	73%	----	----	----	----	----	----	----
BEATTY E.	71%	77%	77%	----	----	----	----	----	----	----
BECKLEY E.	66%	58%	56%	----	----	----	----	----	----	----
BELL E.	35%	38%	35%	----	----	----	----	----	----	----
BENDORF E.	63%	67%	63%	----	----	----	----	----	----	----
BENNETT E.	44%	50%	44%	----	----	----	----	----	----	----
BOWLER E.	72%	69%	59%	----	----	----	----	----	----	----

ELEMENTARY STUDENT PERFORMANCE

CLARK (CONT.)

	NATIONAL PERCENTILE RANK OF AVE.SCORE						PERCENT OF 6TH GRADERS COMPETENT			
SCHOOL	READ GR.3	MATH GR.3	LANG GR.3	READ GR.6	MATH GR.6	LANG GR.6	WRITING IDEAS	WRITING ORGANIZ.	WRITING VOICE	WRITING CONVENT'N
BRACKEN E.	36%	48%	37%	---	---	---	---	---	---	---
CAHLAN E.	55%	51%	48%	---	---	---	---	---	---	---
CHRISTENSEN E.	71%	81%	79%	---	---	---	---	---	---	---
COX, C. E.	48%	50%	42%	---	---	---	---	---	---	---
COX, D. E.	73%	78%	69%	---	---	---	---	---	---	---
CRAIG E.	20%	26%	24%	---	---	---	---	---	---	---
CRESTWOOD E.	36%	54%	37%	---	---	---	---	---	---	---
CULLEY E.	44%	59%	54%	---	---	---	---	---	---	---
CUNNINGHAM E.	56%	65%	60%	---	---	---	---	---	---	---
DAILEY E.	46%	49%	45%	---	---	---	---	---	---	---
DEARING E.	46%	52%	40%	---	---	---	---	---	---	---
DECKER E.	63%	71%	60%	---	---	---	---	---	---	---
DERFELT E.	72%	76%	69%	---	---	---	---	---	---	---
DESKIN E.	70%	66%	63%	---	---	---	---	---	---	---
DiSKIN E.	59%	68%	59%	---	---	---	---	---	---	---
DONDERO E.	73%	71%	71%	---	---	---	---	---	---	---
DOOLEY E.	71%	75%	76%	---	---	---	---	---	---	---
EARL, I. E.	52%	54%	57%	---	---	---	---	---	---	---
EARL, M. E.	68%	76%	69%	---	---	---	---	---	---	---

ELEMENTARY STUDENT PERFORMANCE

CLARK (CONT.)

	NATIONAL PERCENTILE RANK OF AVE.SCORE						PERCENT OF 6TH GRADERS COMPETENT			
SCHOOL	READ GR.3	MATH GR.3	LANG GR.3	READ GR.6	MATH GR.6	LANG GR.6	WRITING IDEAS	WRITING ORGANIZ.	WRITING VOICE	WRITING CONVENT'N
EDWARDS E.	60%	70%	69%	----	----	----	----	----	----	----
EISENBERG-KAHRE E.	65%	67%	68%	----	----	----	----	----	----	----
FERRON E.	55%	67%	63%	----	----	----	----	----	----	----
FONG E.	61%	74%	68%	----	----	----	----	----	----	----
FRENCH E.	68%	78%	63%	----	----	----	----	----	----	----
FYFE E.	57%	57%	47%	----	----	----	----	----	----	----
GALLOWAY E.	71%	77%	65%	----	----	----	----	----	----	----
GIBSON E.	75%	77%	82%	----	----	----	----	----	----	----
GRAGSON E.	59%	62%	46%	----	----	----	----	----	----	----
GRAY E.	74%	72%	74%	----	----	----	----	----	----	----
GRIFFITH E.	50%	52%	30%	----	----	----	----	----	----	----
HANCOCK E.	60%	66%	57%	----	----	----	----	----	----	----
HARMON E.	46%	54%	50%	----	----	----	----	----	----	----
HARRIS E.	76%	83%	68%	----	----	----	----	----	----	----
HEARD E.	64%	70%	62%	----	----	----	----	----	----	----
HERR E.	42%	39%	34%	----	----	----	----	----	----	----
HERRON E.	23%	32%	27%	----	----	----	----	----	----	----
HEWETSON E.	36%	44%	32%	----	----	----	----	----	----	----
HILL E.	60%	56%	56%	----	----	----	----	----	----	----

ELEMENTARY STUDENT PERFORMANCE

CLARK (CONT.)

	NATIONAL PERCENTILE RANK OF AVE.SCORE						PERCENT OF 6TH GRADERS COMPETENT			
SCHOOL	READ GR.3	MATH GR.3	LANG GR.3	READ GR.6	MATH GR.6	LANG GR.6	WRITING IDEAS	WRITING ORGANIZ.	WRITING VOICE	WRITING CONVENT'N
HINMAN E.	57%	57%	41%	---	---	---	---	---	---	---
INDIAN SPRINGS E.	44%	39%	45%	---	---	---	---	---	---	---
JACOBSON E.	72%	68%	76%	---	---	---	---	---	---	---
JUDSTRUP E.	49%	59%	52%	---	---	---	---	---	---	---
KATZ-MCMILLAN E.	62%	73%	64%	---	---	---	---	---	---	---
KIM E.	55%	54%	55%	---	---	---	---	---	---	---
KING, M.L. E.	45%	37%	47%	---	---	---	---	---	---	---
KING, M.P. E.	60%	59%	44%	---	---	---	---	---	---	---
LAKE E.	52%	66%	50%	---	---	---	---	---	---	---
LINCOLN E.	21%	39%	33%	---	---	---	---	---	---	---
LONG E.	70%	68%	64%	---	---	---	---	---	---	---
LUNT E.	18%	34%	15%	---	---	---	---	---	---	---
LYNCH E.	43%	32%	33%	---	---	---	---	---	---	---
MACK E.	69%	74%	70%	---	---	---	---	---	---	---
MANCH E.	43%	49%	42%	---	---	---	---	---	---	---
MAY E.	61%	57%	52%	---	---	---	---	---	---	---
MCCAW E.	59%	57%	57%	---	---	---	---	---	---	---
MCDONIEL E.	78%	82%	77%	---	---	---	---	---	---	---
MCWILLIAMS E.	36%	43%	39%	---	---	---	---	---	---	---

ELEMENTARY STUDENT PERFORMANCE

CLARK (CONT.)

	NATIONAL PERCENTILE RANK OF AVE.SCORE						PERCENT OF 6TH GRADERS COMPETENT			
SCHOOL	READ GR.3	MATH GR.3	LANG GR.3	READ GR.6	MATH GR.6	LANG GR.6	WRITING IDEAS	WRITING ORGANIZ.	WRITING VOICE	WRITING CONVENT'N
MENDOZA E.	62%	67%	59%	---	---	---	---	---	---	---
MOUNTAIN VIEW E.	54%	59%	53%	---	---	---	---	---	---	---
PARADISE E.	29%	63%	29%	---	---	---	---	---	---	---
PARK E.	42%	66%	35%	---	---	---	---	---	---	---
PARSON E.	51%	69%	58%	---	---	---	---	---	---	---
PERKINS E.	59%	72%	59%	---	---	---	---	---	---	---
PITTMAN E.	59%	61%	49%	---	---	---	---	---	---	---
RED ROCK E.	59%	64%	50%	---	---	---	---	---	---	---
REED E.	58%	58%	50%	---	---	---	---	---	---	---
RONNOW E.	56%	64%	52%	---	---	---	---	---	---	---
RONZONE E.	56%	59%	47%	---	---	---	---	---	---	---
ROWE E.	52%	71%	58%	---	---	---	---	---	---	---
RUNDLE E.	59%	63%	55%	---	---	---	---	---	---	---
SANDY VALLEY E.	58%	61%	59%	---	---	---	---	---	---	---
SEWELL E.	56%	60%	51%	---	---	---	---	---	---	---
SMITH, H. E.	68%	70%	61%	---	---	---	---	---	---	---
SQUIRES E.	20%	26%	19%	---	---	---	---	---	---	---
STANFORD E.	70%	79%	71%	---	---	---	---	---	---	---

ELEMENTARY STUDENT PERFORMANCE

CLARK (CONT.)

	NATIONAL PERCENTILE RANK OF AVE.SCORE						PERCENT OF 6TH GRADERS COMPETENT			
SCHOOL	READ GR.3	MATH GR.3	LANG GR.3	READ GR.6	MATH GR.6	LANG GR.6	WRITING IDEAS	WRITING ORGANIZ.	WRITING VOICE	WRITING CONVENT'N
SUNRISE ACRE E.	23%	29%	19%	---	---	---	---	---	---	---
TATE E.	39%	43%	44%	---	---	---	---	---	---	---
TAYLOR, R. E.	35%	27%	37%	---	---	---	---	---	---	---
THOMAS E.	44%	45%	34%	---	---	---	---	---	---	---
THORPE E.	NR	NR	NR	---	---	---	---	---	---	---
TOBLER E.	70%	74%	76%	---	---	---	---	---	---	---
TOMIYASU E.	70%	72%	61%	---	---	---	---	---	---	---
TREEM E.	62%	75%	54%	---	---	---	---	---	---	---
TWIN LAKES E.	43%	43%	42%	---	---	---	---	---	---	---
ULLOM E.	54%	55%	48%	---	---	---	---	---	---	---
VEGAS VERDES E.	58%	61%	61%	---	---	---	---	---	---	---
VIRGIN VALLEY E.	62%	76%	54%	---	---	---	---	---	---	---
WARREN E.	54%	63%	55%	---	---	---	---	---	---	---
WASDEN E.	60%	66%	51%	---	---	---	---	---	---	---
WENGERT E.	58%	59%	52%	---	---	---	---	---	---	---
WHITNEY E.	43%	43%	39%	---	---	---	---	---	---	---
WILLIAMS E.	35%	47%	31%	---	---	---	---	---	---	---
WYNN E.	61%	72%	59%	---	---	---	---	---	---	---

ELEMENTARY STUDENT PERFORMANCE

CLARK (CONT.)

	NATIONAL PERCENTILE RANK OF AVE.SCORE						PERCENT OF 6TH GRADERS COMPETENT			
SCHOOL	READ GR.3	MATH GR.3	LANG GR.3	READ GR.6	MATH GR.6	LANG GR.6	WRITING IDEAS	WRITING ORGANIZ.	WRITING VOICE	WRITING CONVENT'N
WASDEN JH.	---	---	---	61%	77%	68%	69.9%	61.4%	77.1%	68.7%
BOOKER 6TH	---	---	---	56%	69%	54%	NR	NR	NR	NR

DOUGLAS

	NATIONAL PERCENTILE RANK OF AVE.SCORE						PERCENT OF 6TH GRADERS COMPETENT			
SCHOOL	READ GR.3	MATH GR.3	LANG GR.3	READ GR.6	MATH GR.6	LANG GR.6	WRITINGI DEAS	WRITING ORGANIZ.	WRITING VOICE	WRITING CONVENT'N
KINGSBURY MS.	---	---	---	55%	66%	59%	52.0%	45.0%	57.0%	45.0%
GARDNERVILLE E.	66%	69%	68%	67%	68%	71%	73.0%	63.0%	74.0%	69.0%
JACKS VALLEY E.	58%	58%	58%	62%	67%	57%	57.0%	60.0%	68.0%	61.0%
MENELEY E.	66%	73%	64%	53%	67%	56%	56.0%	58.0%	72.0%	64.0%
SCARSELLI E.	63%	69%	60%	60%	76%	61%	63.0%	53.0%	73.0%	66.0%
ZEPHYR COVE E.	63%	62%	65%	---	---	---	---	---	---	---

ELEMENTARY STUDENT PERFORMANCE

ELKO

	NATIONAL PERCENTILE RANK OF AVE.SCORE						PERCENT OF 6TH GRADERS COMPETENT			
SCHOOL	READ GR.3	MATH GR.3	LANG GR.3	READ GR.6	MATH GR.6	LANG GR.6	WRITING IDEAS	WRITING ORGANIZ.	WRITING VOICE	WRITING CONVENT'N
CARLIN COMPLETE S.	61%	65%	59%	59%	53%	43%	57.0%	51.9%	68.4%	62.7%
JACKPOT COMPLETE S.	48%	63%	52%	58%	60%	69%	35.3%	23.5%	52.9%	47.1%
OWYHEE COMPLETE S.	36%	31%	25%	51%	33%	47%	65.5%	65.5%	58.6%	69.0%
WELLS COMPLETE S.	75%	56%	80%	48%	47%	47%	43.8%	43.8%	50.0%	31.3%
ELKO GRAMMAR 2 E.	63%	52%	57%	58%	60%	54%	62.3%	64.2%	67.9%	54.7%
MT. VIEW E.	68%	62%	57%	63%	69%	63%	64.7%	65.5%	75.6%	69.7%
NORTHSIDE E.	76%	58%	68%	70%	56%	70%	61.1%	50.0%	69.4%	63.9%
RURALS E.	57%	51%	54%	58%	52%	55%	75.0%	67.0%	67.0%	75.0%
SAGE E.	64%	62%	66%	----	----	----	----	----	----	----
SOUTHSIDE E.	49%	43%	47%	57%	56%	62%	58.0%	56.8%	60.5%	67.9%
SPRING CREEK E.	70%	62%	69%	56%	45%	58%	57.0%	51.9%	68.4%	62.7%
WEST WENDOVER E.	33%	33%	31%	42%	44%	48%	56.3%	49.3%	57.7%	53.5%

ESMERALDA

	NATIONAL PERCENTILE RANK OF AVE.SCORE						PERCENT OF 6TH GRADERS COMPETENT			
SCHOOL	READ GR.3	MATH GR.3	LANG GR.3	READ GR.6	MATH GR.6	LANG GR.6	WRITING IDEAS	WRITING ORGANIZ.	WRITING VOICE	WRITING CONVENT'N
ALL	43%	58%	47%	43%	50%	43%	30.0%	30.0%	10.0%	10.0%

ELEMENTARY STUDENT PERFORMANCE

EUREKA

	NATIONAL PERCENTILE RANK OF AVE.SCORE						PERCENT OF 6TH GRADERS COMPETENT			
SCHOOL	READ GR.3	MATH GR.3	LANG GR.3	READ GR.6	MATH GR.6	LANG GR.6	WRITING IDEAS	WRITING ORGANIZ.	WRITING VOICE	WRITING CONVENT'N
EUREKA E.	66%	61%	54%	46%	71%	61%	NR	NR	NR	NR
BEOWAWE E.	80%	82%	67%	61%	68%	72%	NR	NR	NR	NR

HUMBOLDT

	NATIONAL PERCENTILE RANK OF AVE.SCORE						PERCENT OF 6TH GRADERS COMPETENT			
SCHOOL	READ GR.3	MATH GR.3	LANG GR.3	READ GR.6	MATH GR.6	LANG GR.6	WRITING IDEAS	WRITING ORGANIZ.	WRITING VOICE	WRITING CONVENT'N
MCDERMITT COMPLETE S.	45%	27%	29%	33%	13%	34%	NR	NR	NR	NR
WINNEMUCCA JH.	---	---	---	52%	51%	49%	NR	NR	NR	NR
GRASS VALLEY E.	56%	69%	67%	---	---	---	---	---	---	---
RURALS E.	43%	38%	41%	46%	46%	46%	NR	NR	NR	NR
SONOMA HEIGHT E.	58%	58%	55%	---	---	---	---	---	---	---
WINNEMUCCA G E.	63%	65%	64%	---	---	---	---	---	---	---

ELEMENTARY STUDENT PERFORMANCE

LANDER

SCHOOL	NATIONAL PERCENTILE RANK OF AVE.SCORE						PERCENT OF 6TH GRADERS COMPETENT			
	READ GR.3	MATH GR.3	LANG GR.3	READ GR.6	MATH GR.6	LANG GR.6	WRITING IDEAS	WRITING ORGANIZ.	WRITING VOICE	WRITING CONVENT'N
BATTLE MT. JH.	----	----	----	54%	73%	64%	47.9%	48.7%	63.0%	60.5%
AUSTIN E.	81%	61%	71%	57%	29%	54%	71.4%	57.1%	71.4%	42.9%
BLACK/PIERCE E.	59%	59%	58%	----	----	----	----	----	----	----

LINCOLN

SCHOOL	NATIONAL PERCENTILE RANK OF AVE.SCORE						PERCENT OF 6TH GRADERS COMPETENT			
	READ GR.3	MATH GR.3	LANG GR.3	READ GR.6	MATH GR.6	LANG GR.6	WRITING IDEAS	WRITING ORGANIZ.	WRITING VOICE	WRITING CONVENT'N
CALIENTE E.	52%	59%	49%	60%	69%	64%	38.0%	44.0%	44.0%	63.0%
PAHRANAGAT E.	52%	50%	47%	61%	43%	57%	61.0%	71.0%	68.0%	56.0%
PANACA E.	65%	73%	62%	42%	54%	43%	67.0%	72.0%	67.0%	67.0%
PIOCHE E.	NR	NR	NR	50%	42%	54%	36.0%	57.0%	71.0%	50.0%

ELEMENTARY STUDENT PERFORMANCE

LYON

	NATIONAL PERCENTILE RANK OF AVE.SCORE						PERCENT OF 6TH GRADERS COMPETENT			
SCHOOL	READ GR.3	MATH GR.3	LANG GR.3	READ GR.6	MATH GR.6	LANG GR.6	WRITING IDEAS	WRITING ORGANIZ.	WRITING VOICE	WRITING CONVENT'N
SMITH VALLEY COMPLETE S	64%	53%	53%	54%	64%	77%	70.0%	75.0%	70.0%	80.0%
DAYTON INTERMEDIATE S.	----	----	----	48%	40%	50%	52.6%	54.6%	59.8%	57.7%
FERNLEY INTERMEDIATE S.	----	----	----	54%	60%	52%	58.2%	54.6%	73.0%	58.9%
YERINGTON INTERMED. S.	----	----	----	49%	48%	47%	65.2%	50.6%	67.4%	50.6%
COTTONWOOD E.	64%	59%	71%	----	----	----	----	----	----	----
DAYTON E.	60%	55%	53%	----	----	----	----	----	----	----
FERNLEY E.	41%	29%	33%	----	----	----	----	----	----	----
SILVER SPRINGS E.	42%	28%	46%	----	----	----	----	----	----	----
YERINGTON E.	52%	55%	44%	----	----	----	----	----	----	----

MINERAL

	NATIONAL PERCENTILE RANK OF AVE.SCORE						PERCENT OF 6TH GRADERS COMPETENT			
SCHOOL	READ GR.3	MATH GR.3	LANG GR.3	READ GR.6	MATH GR.6	LANG GR.6	WRITING IDEAS	WRITING ORGANIZ.	WRITING VOICE	WRITING CONVENT'N
HAWTHORNE E.	59%	54%	36%	39%	42%	34%	41.7%	37.9%	58.9%	40.8%
SCHURZ E.	NR	NR	NR	NR	NR	NR	NR	NR	NR	NR

ELEMENTARY STUDENT PERFORMANCE

NYE

	NATIONAL PERCENTILE RANK OF AVE.SCORE						PERCENT OF 6TH GRADERS COMPETENT			
SCHOOL	READ GR.3	MATH GR.3	LANG GR.3	READ GR.6	MATH GR.6	LANG GR.6	WRITING IDEAS	WRITING ORGANIZ.	WRITING VOICE	WRITING CONVENT'N
PAHRUMP 5/6	----	----	----	39%	40%	35%	42.0%	39.0%	51.0%	55.0%
ARMAGOSA VALLEY E.	31%	32%	27%	40%	44%	43%	58.3%	50.0%	66.6%	75.0%
BEATTY E.	49%	60%	40%	46%	53%	47%	68.4%	63.2%	57.9%	68.4%
GABBS E.	57%	61%	59%	39%	39%	43%	21.0%	35.0%	21.0%	57.0%
PAHRUMP INTERMEDIATE S.	37%	43%	40%	----	----	----	----	----	----	----
ROUND MT. E.	52%	54%	57%	60%	46%	38%	33.3%	33.3%	27.8%	38.9%
SILVER RIM E.	45%	62%	49%	----	----	----	----	----	----	----
TONOPAH E.	29%	35%	29%	47%	44%	42%	60.0%	56.0%	68.0%	62.0%

PERSHING

	NATIONAL PERCENTILE RANK OF AVE.SCORE						PERCENT OF 6TH GRADERS COMPETENT			
SCHOOL	READ GR.3	MATH GR.3	LANG GR.3	READ GR.6	MATH GR.6	LANG GR.6	WRITING IDEAS	WRITING ORGANIZ.	WRITING VOICE	WRITING CONVENT'N
PERSHING MIDDLE S.	----	----	----	41%	48%	43%	53.3%	51.7%	53.3%	60.0%
LOVELOCK E.	56%	50.5%	33%	----	----	----	----	----	----	----

ELEMENTARY STUDENT PERFORMANCE

STOREY

	NATIONAL PERCENTILE RANK OF AVE.SCORE						PERCENT OF 6TH GRADERS COMPETENT			
SCHOOL	READ GR.3	MATH GR.3	LANG GR.3	READ GR.6	MATH GR.6	LANG GR.6	WRITING IDEAS	WRITING ORGANIZ.	WRITING VOICE	WRITING CONVENT'N
VIRGINIA CITY MIDDLE S.	---	---	---	65%	60%	46%	55.3%	42.1%	60.5%	68.4%
GALLAGHER E.	68%	68%	67%	---	---	---	---	---	---	---
HILLSIDE E.	52%	47%	46%	51%	38%	46%	53.0%	53.0%	61.0%	61.0%

ELEMENTARY STUDENT PERFORMANCE

WASHOE

	NATIONAL PERCENTILE RANK OF AVE.SCORE						PERCENT OF 6TH GRADERS COMPETENT			
SCHOOL	READ GR.3	MATH GR.3	LANG GR.3	READ GR.6	MATH GR.6	LANG GR.6	WRITING IDEAS	WRITING ORGANIZ.	WRITING VOICE	WRITING CONVENT'N
GERLACH H.	---	---	---	72%	84%	70%	87.5%	75.0%	87.5%	87.5%
INCLINE MIDDLE S.	---	---	---	61%	61%	56%	73.6%	70.8%	73.6%	55.7%
ALLEN E.	38%	38%	35%	40%	50%	35%	30.0%	30.0%	30.0%	50.0%
ANDERSON E.	46%	53%	43%	41%	53%	51%	55.1%	61.2%	55.1%	55.1%
BECK E.	75%	77%	76%	72%	84%	76%	83.3%	81.3%	83.3%	75.0%
BOOTH E.	45%	45%	50%	38%	48%	43%	77.0%	67.6%	77.0%	68.9%
BROWN E.	68%	71%	61%	65%	83%	70%	72.9%	64.6%	72.9%	66.7%
CANNAN E.	40%	58%	49%	52%	62%	58%	58.2%	55.2%	58.2%	49.3%
CAUGHLIN RANCH E.	78%	81%	78%	79%	84%	82%	72.9%	64.6%	72.9%	66.7%
CORBETT, R. E.	43%	48%	51%	47%	50%	50%	37.8%	31.1%	37.8%	40.0%
DIEDRICHSEN E.	71%	70%	78%	69%	83%	77%	81.4%	73.3%	81.4%	73.3%
DODSON E.	64%	64%	71%	73%	82%	80%	66.7%	65.2%	66.7%	72.5%
DRAKE E.	66%	66%	68%	58%	53%	63%	58.8%	64.7%	58.8%	76.5%
DUNCAN E.	25%	30%	30%	34%	31%	36%	20.5%	18.2%	20.5%	27.3%
DUNN E.	58%	60%	57%	65%	67%	67%	52.5%	49.5%	52.5%	67.3%
ELMCREST E.	62%	63%	63%	62%	55%	59%	57.3%	51.2%	57.3%	64.6%
GOMES E.	59%	59%	61%	56%	55%	56%	52.5%	50.8%	52.5%	57.6%
GOMM E.	81%	86%	86%	84%	90%	82%	88.2%	82.9%	88.2%	78.9%
GREENBRAE E.	56%	62%	52%	58%	54%	59%	62.2%	55.6%	62.2%	53.3%

ELEMENTARY STUDENT PERFORMANCE

WASHOE (CONT.)

	NATIONAL PERCENTILE RANK OF AVE.SCORE						PERCENT OF 6TH GRADERS COMPETENT			
SCHOOL	READ GR.3	MATH GR.3	LANG GR.3	READ GR.6	MATH GR.6	LANG GR.6	WRITING IDEAS	WRITING ORGANIZ.	WRITING VOICE	WRITING CONVENT'N
HIDDEN VALLEY E.	63%	64%	63%	59%	59%	57%	74.7%	64.0%	74.7%	74.7%
HUFFAKER E.	71%	75%	71%	77%	80%	74%	78.8%	75.3%	78.8%	75.3%
HUNTER LAKE E.	67%	65%	71%	68%	73%	71%	67.3%	67.3%	67.3%	72.7%
INCLINE E.	60%	65%	57%	----	----	----	----	----	----	----
JOHNSON E.	60%	65%	57%	----	----	----	----	----	----	----
JUNIPER E.	70%	71%	72%	66%	69%	66%	65.7%	55.7%	65.7%	60.0%
LEMMON VALLEY E.	53%	48%	50%	40%	45%	43%	41.6%	48.3%	41.6%	48.3%
LENZ E.	74%	80%	76%	69%	71%	69%	76.1%	73.2%	76.1%	71.8%
LINCOLN PARK E.	34%	35%	31%	48%	50%	46%	44.2%	38.5%	44.2%	55.8%
LODER E.	39%	38%	34%	29%	29%	32%	41.4%	31.0%	41.4%	41.4%
MAXWELL E.	58%	60%	52%	65%	82%	68%	58.3%	54.2%	58.3%	59.7%
MITCHELL, R. E.	50%	59%	44%	55%	46%	48%	58.5%	48.6%	59.5%	43.2%
MOSS E.	68%	78%	71%	57%	57%	57%	53.6%	55.4%	53.6%	58.9%
MOUNT ROSE E.	52%	48%	51%	53%	56%	57%	65.8%	63.2%	65.8%	76.3%
NATCHEZ E.	42%	31%	34%	38%	38%	45%	58.8%	41.2%	58.8%	52.9%
PALMER E.	26%	24%	23%	43%	35%	43%	43.6%	21.8%	43.6%	43.6%
PEAVINE E.	68%	74%	68%	68%	72%	67%	65.5%	63.8%	65.5%	70.7%
PLEASANT VALLEY E.	74%	70%	71%	69%	61%	70%	64.2%	65.7%	64.2%	70.1%
RISLEY E.	56%	63%	59%	49%	47%	45%	53.1%	53.1%	53.1%	39.1%

ELEMENTARY STUDENT PERFORMANCE

WASHOE (CONT.)

	NATIONAL PERCENTILE RANK OF AVE.SCORE						PERCENT OF 6TH GRADERS COMPETENT			
SCHOOL	READ GR.3	MATH GR.3	LANG GR.3	READ GR.6	MATH GR.6	LANG GR.6	WRITING IDEAS	WRITING ORGANIZ.	WRITING VOICE	WRITING CONVENT'N
SIERRA VISTA E.	40%	33%	28%	43%	45%	40%	54.8%	38.1%	54.8%	50.0%
SILVER LAKE E.	49%	57%	44%	55%	53%	58%	47.4%	45.4%	47.4%	50.4%
SMITH, A. E.	54%	47%	43%	49%	51%	49%	54.7%	52.0%	54.7%	48.0%
SMITH, K. E.	53%	46%	56%	30%	42%	44%	58.1%	51.6%	58.1%	51.6%
SMITHRIDGE E.	46%	61%	45%	44%	47%	44%	50.0%	48.4%	50.0%	54.7%
STEAD E.	41%	41%	45%	50%	52%	54%	39.7%	33.3%	39.7%	43.6%
SUN VALLEY E.	49%	45%	43%	47%	40%	39%	38.3%	25.5%	38.3%	53.2%
TAYLOR, A. E.	54%	51%	51%	52%	49%	51%	72.9%	65.9%	72.9%	64.7%
TOWLES E.	67%	55%	59%	71%	72%	74%	67.2%	69.0%	67.2%	69.0%
VERDI E.	75%	82%	78%	78%	86%	75%	66.7%	68.9%	66.7%	73.3%
VETERAN'S M. E.	45%	44%	41%	50%	60%	50%	69.8%	53.5%	69.8%	62.8%
WARNER E.	63%	75%	69%	60%	52%	60%	68.2%	59.1%	68.2%	54.5%
WESTERGARD E.	75%	75%	76%	69%	79%	75%	82.5%	68.8%	82.5%	81.3%
WHITEHEAD E.	73%	73%	81%	72%	80%	73%	69.7%	61.8%	69.7%	77.6%

ELEMENTARY STUDENT PERFORMANCE

WHITE PINE

	NATIONAL PERCENTILE RANK OF AVE.SCORE						PERCENT OF 6TH GRADERS COMPETENT			
SCHOOL	READ GR.3	MATH GR.3	LANG GR.3	READ GR.6	MATH GR.6	LANG GR.6	WRITING IDEAS	WRITING ORGANIZ.	WRITING VOICE	WRITING CONVENT'N
LUND E.	71%	45%	64%	60%	54%	56%	69.2%	53.8%	61.5%	92.3%
MCGILL E.	55%	47%	64%	----	----	----	----	----	----	----
MOUNTAIN VIEW E.	63%	55%	57%	----	----	----	----	----	----	----
WHITE PINE MIDDLE S.	----	----	----	52%	45%	38%	47.5%	42.6%	51.5%	47.5%

Table C9 – SECONDARY SCHOOL CHARACTERISTICS

CARSON

SCHOOL	ENROLL	ENROLL CHANGE	TRANS'Y RATE	ATTEND RATE	COUNSEL /STUDNT	PAR'T/T'CHR CONFERENCE ATTENDANCE	PER PUPIL EXPENDITURE INSTRUCTION	PER PUPIL EXPENDITURE ADMINISTRAT'N	PER PUPIL EXPENDITURE OPERATIONS
CARSON HIGH	1361	5.7%	23.0%	90.5%	419	NR	NR	NR	NR
CARSON JR. HIGH	906	8.9%	26.2	92.4%	453	NR	NR	NR	NR
EAGLE VALLEY JR.HI	674	4.2%	18.0	94.2%	337	NR	NR	NR	NE

CHURCHILL

SCHOOL	ENROLL	ENROLL CHANGE	TRANS'Y RATE	ATTEND RATE	COUNSEL /STUDNT	PAR'NT/T'CHR CONFERENCE ATTENDANCE	PER PUPIL EXPENDITURE INSTRUCTION	PER PUPIL EXPENDITURE ADMINSITRAT'N	PER PUPIL EXPENDITURE OPERATION
CHURCHILL HIGH	990	4.1%	20.6%	94.1%	330	26.5%	$2815	$491	$1063
CHURCHILL JR HIGH	562	7.6%	20.8%	96.7%	562	18.7%	$2600	$470	$760

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

SECONDARY SCHOOL CHARACTERISTICS

CLARK

SCHOOL	ENROLL	ENROLL CHANGE	TRANS'Y RATE	ATTEND RATE	COUNSEL /STUDNT	PAR'NT/T'CHR CONFERENCE ATTENDANCE	PER PUPIL EXPENDITURE INSTRUCTION	PER PUPIL EXPENDITURE ADMINISTRAT'N	PER PUPIL EXPENDITURE OPERATIONS
BASIC HIGH	2174	1.3%	21.4%	90.5%	544	65.0%	$2526	$582	$568
BONANZA HIGH	2643	-2.3%	21.2%	91.8%	378	NR	$2448	$627	$451
BOULDER HIGH	719	-3.1%	14.1%	92.9%	360	NR	$3292	$844	$765
CHAPARRAL HIGH	2925	8.6%	23.9%	90.2%	418	45.0%	$2369	$595	$465
CHEYENNE HIGH	2051	49.9%	24.8%	88.1%	410	62.0%	$2294	$620	$571
CIMARRON-MEMORIAL	2626	38.2%	27.2%	93.1%	375	40.0%	$2502	$635	$478
CLARK HIGH	2649	-3.2%	27.7%	91.7%	378	NR	$2422	$611	$480
ELDORADO HIGH	2485	3.0%	24.1%	87.0%	355	65.0%	$2414	$580	$487
GREEN VALLLEY HIGH	2952	39.0%	17.6%	92.3%	422	NR	$2204	$593	$462
HORIZON HIGH	NR	NR	NR	NR	NR	NR	NR	NR	NR
LAS VEGAS HIGH	1978	-4.2%	34.9%	89.3%	330	40.0%	$2558	$677	$577
RANCHO HIGH	2888	0.6%	34.5%	84.7%	263	35.5%	$2510	$650	$480
SNVTC HIGH	1240	-0.5%	21.0%	85.5%	310	NR	$3680	$708	$836
SUNSET HIGH	NR	NR	NR	NR	NR	NR	NR	NR	NR
VALLEY HIGH	2734	4.0%	31.6%	90.2%	304	35.0%	$2321	$599	$443
WESTERN HIGH	1959	-15.4%	29.7%	92.8%	327	30.0%	$2668	$632	$601
INDIAN SPRINGS HI/JR	185	10.1%	26.6%	91.8%	185	90.0%	$5673	$2021	$1406
LAUGHLIN HIGH/JR	431	12.5%	26.8%	93.2%	431	10.0%	$3253	$906	$1509
MOAPA VALLEY HI/JR	865	10.3%	8.0%	93.3%	433	50.0%	$3145	$728	$630

SECONDARY SCHOOL CHARACTERISTICS

CLARK (CONT.)

SCHOOL	ENROLL	ENROLL CHANGE	TRANS'Y RATE	ATTEND RATE	COUNSEL /STUDNT	PAR'NT/T'CHR CONFERENCE ATTENDANCE	PER PUPIL EXPENDITURE INSTRUCTION	PER PUPIL EXPENDITURE ADMINISTRAT'N	PER PUPIL EXPENDITURE OPERATIONS
VIRGIN VALLEY HI/JR	500	8.2%	17.9%	93.5%	500	43.0%	$4127	$929	$1012
BROWN JR. HIGH	858	4.9%	27.1%	93.6%	429	33.0%	$2703	$689	$508
CANNON JR. HIGH	1073	16.8%	22.0%	92.7%	537	65.0%	$2493	$612	$494
FREMONT JR. HIGH	941	-5.0%	33.3%	92.5%	471	60.0%	$2889	$657	$495
GREENSPUN JR. HIGH	1512	-4.8%	14.3%	93.6%	504	45.0%	$2553	$601	$436
GUINN JR. HIGH	1714	4.6%	19.2%	94.3%	429	NR	$2261	$569	$402
HYDE PARK JR. HIGH	683	1.8%	28.3%	93.9%	342	75.0%	$2832	$789	$680
JOHNSON JR. HIGH	1265	12.2%	22.3%	94.0%	422	58.0%	$2631	$591	$516
KNUDSON JR. HIGH	775	-5.1%	33.1%	90.8%	388	70.0%	$2777	$750	$518
SANDY VALLEY JR HI	68	15.3%	12.8%	91.3%	360	85.0%	$2950	$1243	$594
VON TOBEL JR. HIGH	1072	0.8%	34.8%	92.4%	536	50.0%	$2442	$618	$536
BRIDGER MIDDLE S	1057	-2.0%	34.6%	92.8%	529	50.0%	$2533	$625	$476
BRINLEY MIDDLE S	1387	7.8%	24.0%	94.0%	462	70.0%	$2368	$616	$438
BURKHOLDER MIDDLE	1116	1.0%	23.4%	94.0%	558	80.0%	$2449	$599	$471
CASHMAN MIDDLE S	923	-1.3%	34.7%	87.4%	462	75.0%	$2798	$670	$531
GARRETT MIDDLE S	604	4.7%	20.0%	94.7%	604	50.0%	$3176	$858	$563
GARSIDE MIDDLE S	881	3.0%	27.9%	90.2%	441	70.0%	$2904	$675	$523
GIBSON MIDDLE S	1008	-22.7%	29.0%	91.0%	504	50.0%	$2740	$651	$445
MARTIN MIDDLE S	944	-1.3%	36.9%	91.8%	315	40.0%	$2968	$681	$503

SECONDARY SCHOOL CHARACTERISTICS

CLARK (CONT.)

SCHOOL	ENROLL	ENROLL CHANGE	TRANS'Y RATE	ATTEND RATE	COUNSEL /STUDNT	PAR'NT/T'CHR CONFERENCE ATTENDANCE	PER PUPIL EXPENDITURE INSTRUCTION	PER PUPIL EXPENDITURE ADMINISTRAT'N	PER PUPIL EXPENDITURE OPERATIONS
OCALLAGHAN MIDDLE	1305	27.3%	21.7%	93.2%	435	74.0%	$2293	$634	$501
ORR MIDDLE S	1071	-10.6%	39.5%	91.6%	536	33.0%	$2446	$627	$502
ROBINSON MIDDLE S	1196	-12.4%	30.3%	93.3%	399	40.0%	$2549	$590	$497
SMITH MIDDLE S	811	-32.2%	37.2%	90.9%	406	NR	$2521	$689	$534
SWAINSTON MIDDLE	1444	0.0	29.5%	93.1%	481	85.0%	$2432	$609	$431
WHITE MIDDLE S	900	0.0	29.0%	93.9%	450	83.0%	$2531	$656	$607
WOODBURY MIDDLE	1129	-10.3%	24.2%	90.4%	565	80.0%	$2923	$624	$490
WASDEN JR. HIGH	594	-7.5%	28.5%	93.7%	1188	58.0%	$3228	$583	$461

SECONDARY SCHOOL CHARACTERISTICS

DOUGLAS

SCHOOL	ENROLL	ENROLL CHANGE	TRANS'Y RATE	ATTEND RATE	COUNSEL /STUDNT	PAR'NT/T'CHR CONFERENCE ATTENDANCE	PER PUPIL EXPENDITURE INSTRUCTION	PER PUPIL EXPENDITURE ADMINISTRAT'N	PER PUPIL EXPENDITURE OPERATIONS
DOUGLAS HIGH	1407	13.1%	18.5%	92.0%	369	NR	$2791	$427	$508
WHITTELL HIGH	249	4.0%	22.2%	97.9%	249	91.0%	$3460	$1055	$524
CARSON VALLEY MID.	856	12.0%	14.6%	94.7%	428	91.0%	$2793	$519	$492
KINGSBURY MIDDLE S	286	7.9%	22.0%	96.3%	286	75.5%	$2538	$614	$505

ELKO

SCHOOL	ENROLL	ENROLL CHANGE	TRANS'Y RATE	ATTEND RATE	COUNSEL /STUDNT	PAR'NT/T'CHR CONFERENCE ATTENDANCE	PER PUPIL EXPENDITURE INSTRUCTION	PER PUPIL EXPENDITURE ADMINISTRAT'N	PER PUPIL EXPENDITURE OPERATIONS
ELKO HIGH	1606	5.1%	22.4%	90.6%	402	NR	$2728	$462	$1143
CARLIN COMP. SC	498	3.8%	28.0%	92.2%	498	90.0%	$3359	$705	$1558
JACKPOT COMP. S	302	-8.8%	29.7%	92.1%	302	80.0%	$4492	$780	$2011
OWYHEE COMP. S	369	5.4%	26.2%	92.8%	369	85.0%	$4208	$868	$2012
WELLS COMP. S	451	5.6%	20.8%	91.2%	451	85.7%	$4030	$912	$2096
ELKO JUNIOR HIGH	952	9.0%	16.3%	92.0%	317	60.0%	$2408	$553	$1208

SECONDARY SCHOOL CHARACTERISTICS

EUREKA

SCHOOL	ENROLL	ENROLL CHANGE	TRANS'Y RATE	ATTEND RATE	COUNSEL /STUDNT	PAR'NT/T'CHR CONFERENCE ATTENDANCE	PER PUPIL EXPENDITURE INSTRUCTION	PER PUPIL EXPENDITURE ADMINISTRAT'N	PER PUPIL EXPENDITURE OPERATIONS
EUREKA HIGH	138	2.1%	7.7%	95.2%	138	9.0%	$6093	$2293	$1814

HUMBOLDT

SCHOOL	ENROLL	ENROLL CHANGE	TRANS'Y RATE	ATTEND RATE	COUNSEL /STUDNT	PAR'NT/T'CHR CONFERENCE ATTENDANCE	PER PUPIL EXPENDITURE INSTRUCTION	PER PUPIL EXPENDITURE ADMINISTRAT'N	PER PUPIL EXPENDITURE OPERATIONS
LOWRY HIGH	779	7.3%	24.0%	90.8%	390	50.0%	$2877	$338	$376
MCDERMITT	209	-6.2%	28.0%	92.3%	209	67.0%	$5349	$1071	$1122
WINNEMUCCA JR. HI	718	10.9%	14.8%	94.0%	359	62.0%	$2379	$287	$269

LANDER

SCHOOL	ENROLL	ENROLL CHANGE	TRANS'Y RATE	ATTEND RATE	COUNSEL /STUDNT	PAR'NT/T'CHR CONFERENCE ATTENDANCE	PER PUPIL EXPENDITURE INSTRUCTION	PER PUPIL EXPENDITURE ADMINISTRAT'N	PER PUPIL EXPENDITURE OPERATIONS
BATTLE MT. HIGH	358	13.3%	14.0%	95.5%	358	51.0%	$3261	$637	$1535
AUSTIN HIGH/JR	52	21.9%	14.6%	93.3%	52	37.1%	$2687	$475	$534
BATTLE MT. JR. HIGH	350	0.1%	19.7%	94.3%	350	85.0%	$2802	$617	$474

SECONDARY SCHOOL CHARACTERISTICS

LINCOLN

SCHOOL	ENROLL	ENROLL CHANGE	TRANS'Y RATE	ATTEND RATE	COUNSEL /STUDNT	PAR'NT/T'CHR CONFERENCE ATTENDANCE	PER PUPIL EXPENDITURE INSTRUCTION	PER PUPIL EXPENDITURE ADMINISTRAT'N	PER PUPIL EXPENDITURE OPERATIONS
LINCOLN HIGH	182	1.6%	24.6%	94.5%	182	90.0%	$2921	$1048	$384
PAHRANAGAT HI/JR	135	-1.0%	15.7%	92.4%	157	70.0%	$5549	$881	$620
MEADOW VALLEY MID	111	27.6%	9.8%	95.0%	222	90.0%	$2921	$1048	$384

LYON

SCHOOL	ENROLL	ENROLL CHANGE	TRANS'Y RATE	ATTEND RATE	COUNSEL /STUDNT	PAR'NT/T'CHR CONFERENCE ATTENDANCE	PER PUPIL EXPENDITURE INSTRUCTION	PER PUPIL EXPENDITURE ADMINISTRAT'N	PER PUPIL EXPENDITURE OPERATIONS
DAYTON HIGH	321	12.2%	28.0%	92.3%	321	42.1%	$2993	$920	$814
FERNLEY HIGH	430	8.6%	23.4%	92.7%	430	49.5%	$3277	$726	$774
YERINGTON HIGH	331	-0.3%	23.0%	93.0%	331	36.3%	$3458	$948	$944
SMITH VALLEY COM S	246	1.2%	13.4%	92.8%	246	73.2%	$3330	$713	$822
DAYTON INTERMED	406	13.1%	29.5%	91.5%	271	48.5%	$2659	$576	$573
FERNLEY INTERMED	516	3.6%	24.5%	92.7%	516	54.3%	$2341	$651	$677
YERINGTON INTERM	411	6.5%	18.6%	93.8%	411	68.1%	$2811	$562	$546

SECONDARY SCHOOL CHARACTERISTICS

MINERAL

SCHOOL	ENROLL	ENROLL CHANGE	TRANS'Y RATE	ATTEND RATE	COUNSEL /STUDNT	PAR'NT/T'CHR CONFERENCE ATTENDANCE	PER PUPIL EXPENDITURE INSTRUCTION	PER PUPIL EXPENDITURE ADMINISTRAT'N	PER PUPIL EXPENDITURE OPERATIONS
MINERAL HIGH	287	0.3%	22.0%	90.4%	287	NR	$3327	$611	$922
HAWTHORNE ELEM	730	4.0%	16.4%	93.7%	285	53.0%	$2094	$504	$851
SCHURZ ELEM	114	10.6%	18.7%	90.7%	627	NR	$3975	$613	$575

NYE

SCHOOL	ENROLL	ENROLL CHANGE	TRANS'Y RATE	ATTEND RATE	COUNSEL /STUDNT	PAR'NT/T'CHR CONFERENCE ATTENDANCE	PER PUPIL EXPENDITURE INSTRUCTION	PER PUPIL EXPENDITURE ADMINISTRAT'N	PER PUPIL EXPENDITURE OPERATIONS
BEATTY HIGH	141	2.9%	21.2%	92.9%	537	NR	$3818	$1075	$1163
GABBS HIGH	104	7.0%	17.0%	93.0%	482	10.0%	$3499	$850	$917
PAHRUMP HIGH	487	10.7%	28.1%	91.2%	487	NR	$2924	$723	$651
TONOPAH HIGH	223	-3.9%	29.9%	91.6%	479	26.9%	$3762	$905	$1108
ROUND MT. HIGH/JR.	190	38.7%	19.8%	90.0%	482	39.5%	$2795	$904	$787
PAHRUMP JR. HIGH	288	9.9%	32.0%	91.5%	288	NR	$2354	$384	$1061
ARMAGOSA VALLEY E	143	-6.5%	13.9%	93.4%	537	96.0%	$3636	$1017	$841
BEATTY ELEM	223	0.0	27.6%	93.0%	537	NR	$2759	$552	$671
TONOPAH ELEM	329	4.4%	25.9%	94.3%	495	60.0%	$2949	$709	$792

SECONDARY SCHOOL CHARACTERISTICS

PERSHING

SCHOOL	ENROLL	ENROLL CHANGE	TRANS'Y RATE	ATTEND RATE	COUNSEL /STUDNT	PAR'NT/T'CHR CONFERENCE ATTENDANCE	PER PUPIL EXPENDITURE INSTRUCTION	PER PUPIL EXPENDITURE ADMINISTRAT'N	PER PUPIL EXPENDITURE OPERATIONS
PERSHING HIGH	187	1.0%	31.8%	87.9%	187	NR	$3796	$915	$1109
PERSHING MIDDLE S	195	3.7%	18.5%	90.7%	0	61.0%	$2524	$733	$762

STOREY

SCHOOL	ENROLL	ENROLL CHANGE	TRANS'Y RATE	ATTEND RATE	COUNSEL /STUDNT	PAR'NT/T'CHR CONFERENCE ATTENDANCE	PER PUPIL EXPENDITURE INSTRUCTION	PER PUPIL EXPENDITURE ADMINISTRAT'N	PER PUPIL EXPENDITURE OPERATIONS
VIRGINIA CITY HIGH	127	18.6%	21.2%	92.0%	508	55.0%	$4649	$1290	$668
VIRGINIA CITY MIDDLE	97	12.7%	23.1%	94.3%	388	66.0%	$3741	$1479	$753

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

SECONDARY SCHOOL CHARACTERISTICS

WASHOE

SCHOOL	ENROLL	ENROLL CHANGE	TRANS'Y RATE	ATTEND RATE	COUNSEL /STUDNT	PAR'NT/T'CHR CONFERENCE ATTENDANCE	PER PUPIL EXPENDITURE INSTRUCTION	PER PUPIL EXPENDITURE ADMINISTRAT'N	PER PUPIL EXPENDITURE OPERATIONS
GALENA HIGH	848	0.0	39.0%	95.0%	283	36.5%	$2504	$802	$648
GERLACH HIGH	70	6.1%	36.0%	94.0%	360	100.0%	$5545	$1792	$1077
HUG HIGH	1428	2.9%	49.0%	89.0%	357	16.1%	$2776	$480	$633
INCLINE HIGH	361	9.7%	22.0%	94.0%	241	NR	$3579	$846	$1101
MCQUEEN HIGH	1434	0.4%	24.0%	94.0%	287	50.0%	$2631	$481	$491
REED HIGH	1875	0.0%	29.0%	93.0%	313	NR	$2744	$441	$486
RENO HIGH	1320	-0.4%	41.0%	93.0%	330	NR	$2806	$516	$621
SPARKS HIGH	1516	1.8%	53.0%	90.0%	313	60.0%	$2617	$464	$498
WASHOE HIGH	642	16.9%	0.0%	96.0%	0	NR	$2946	$636	$294
WOOSTER HIGH	1245	-25.4%	57.0%	90.0%	249	NR	$3090	$475	$674
BILLINGHURST MID	661	5.8%	34.0%	95.0%	441	52.9%	$2687	$486	$589
CLAYTON MIDDLE	538	-2.5%	41.0%	93.0%	269	NR	$2743	$572	$519
DILWORTH MIDDLE	648	13.3%	36.0%	93.0%	324	NR	$2296	$490	$457
INCLINE MIDDLE S	312	3.7%	25.0%	92.0%	312	NR	$2971	$621	$662
O'BRIEN MIDDLE S	669	17.0%	31.0%	93.0%	335	NR	$2261	$547	$501
PINE MIDDLE S	704	10.0%	45.0%	91.0%	352	75.0%	$2372	$578	$516
SPARKS MIDDLE S	826	5.8%	28.0%	93.0%	275	NR	$2410	$412	$391
SWOPE MIDDLE S	826	15.0%	29.0%	93.0%	275	NR	$1999	$419	$368
TRANER MIDDLE S	592	11.7%	49.0%	92.0%	296	NR	$2832	$499	$496
VAUGHN MIDDLE S	554	3.4%	54.0%	94.0%	277	50.0%	$2951	$553	$460

SECONDARY SCHOOL CHARACTERISTICS

WHITE PINE

SCHOOL	ENROLL	ENROLL CHANGE	TRANS'Y RATE	ATTEND RATE	COUNSEL /STUDNT	PAR'NT/T'CHR CONFERENCE ATTENDANCE	PER PUPIL EXPENDITURE INSTRUCTION	PER PUPIL EXPENDITURE ADMINISTRAT'N	PER PUPIL EXPENDITURE OPERATIONS
LUND HIGH/JR	60	7.0%	13.0%	95.0%	60	NR	$4742	$2195	$970
WHITE PINE HIGH	475	3.9%	21.0%	91.0%	475	NR	$3399	$766	$585
WHITE PINE MIDDLE S	384	1.6%	18.8%	92.6%	384	100.0%	$3005	$694	$467

Table C10 – SECONDARY CLASSROOMS

CARSON

SCHOOL

	ENGLISH CL. SIZE	MATH CL. SIZE	SCIENCE CL. SIZE	SOC.SCI CL. SIZE	ENG. CL TAUGHT OUT LIC.	MATH CL TAUGHT OUT LIC.	SCI. CL TAUGHT OUT LIC.	SOC.SCI CL TAUGHT OUT LIC.	TEACHERS WITH B.A. ONLY	TEACHERS WITH 10YR.+ EXPERIENCE
CARSON HIGH	30.1	28.3	29.1	27.4	0.0	0.0	0.0	1.3%	58.8%	58.8%
CARSON JR. HIGH	26.3	25.7	22.0	22.5	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	68.0%	66.7%
EAGLE VALLEY JR.HI	22.7	21.0	24.3	26.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	65.3%	56.0%

CHURCHILL

SCHOOL	ENGLISH CL. SIZE	MATH CL. SIZE	SCIENCE CL. SIZE	SOC.SCI CL. SIZE	ENG. CL TAUGHT OUT LIC.	MATH CL TAUGHT OUT LIC.	SCI. CL TAUGHT OUT LIC.	SOC.SCI CL TAUGHT OUT LIC.	TEACHERS WITH B.A. ONLY	TEACHERS WITH 10YR.+ EXPERIENCE
CHURCHILL HIGH	25.2	24.0	24.1	31.5	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	82.0%	49.0%
CHURCHILL JR HIGH	24.1	23.5	22.4	24.5	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	85.0	30.0

SECONDARY CLASSROOMS

CLARK

SCHOOL	ENGLISH CL. SIZE	MATH CL. SIZE	SCIENCE CL. SIZE	SOC.SCI CL. SIZE	ENG. CL TAUGHT OUT LIC.	MATH CL TAUGHT OUT LIC.	SCI. CL TAUGHT OUT LIC.	SOC.SCI CL TAUGHT OUT LIC.	TEACHERS WITH B.A. ONLY	TEACHERS WITH 10YR.+ EXPERIENCE
BASIC HIGH	27.7	29.0	30.0	28.9	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	30.0%	59.0%
BONANZA HIGH	28.9	29.1	29.2	29.1	2.3%	0.0	1.6%	0.0	29.0%	67.0%
BOULDER HIGH	26.4	23.3	23.5	23.7	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	37.0%	66.0%
CHAPARRAL HIGH	25.4	28.5	29.4	28.9	0.0	0.0	4.1%	0.0	30.0%	58.0%
CHEYENNE HIGH	28.6	28.7	27.0	27.1	0.0	0.0	0.0	4.3%	40.0%	42.0%
CIMARRON-MEMORIAL	29.1	26.0	27.2	27.5	5.4%	0.0	0.0	0.0	27.0%	56.0%
CLARK HIGH	25.5	29.1	28.9	25.5	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	27.0%	53.0%
ELDORADO HIGH	28.2	28.2	30.8	26.6	0.0	3.1%	0.0	0.0	29.0%	58.0%
GREEN VALLLEY HIGH	25.7	28.7	29.8	38.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	38.0%	47.0%
HORIZON HIGH	NR	NR	NR	NR	NR	NR	NR	NR	NR	NR
LAS VEGAS HIGH	25.6	26.9	23.9	29.2	0.0	0.0	2.3%	0.0	27.0%	57.0%
RANCHO HIGH	24.4	26.9	25.6	25.2	2.2%	0.0	0.0	0.0	38.0%	37.0%
SNVTC HIGH	21.0	19.3	25.3	24.3	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	19.0%	61.0%
SUNSET HIGH	NR	NR	NR	NR	NR	NR	NR	NR	NR	NR
VALLEY HIGH	26.7	25.8	26.5	27.9	0.0	0.0	9.0%	0.0	34.0%	50.0%
WESTERN HIGH	26.3	27.7	28.9	28.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	23.0%	74.0%
INDIAN SPRINGS HI/JR	11.0	8.8	13.0	11.0	0.0	12.5%	0.0	0.0	58.0%	58.0%
LAUGHLIN HIGH/JR	19.7	21.6	16.9	20.4	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	67.0%	0.0
MOAPA VALLEY HI/JR	20.1	19.9	21.7	20.7	0.0	13.0%	0.0	0.0	44.0%	38.0%

SECONDARY CLASSROOMS

CLARK (CONT.)

SCHOOL	ENGLISH CL. SIZE	MATH CL. SIZE	SCIENCE CL. SIZE	SOC.SCI CL. SIZE	ENG. CL TAUGHT OUT LIC.	MATH CL TAUGHT OUT LIC.	SCI. CL TAUGHT OUT LIC.	SOC.SCI CL TAUGHT OUT LIC.	TEACHERS WITH B.A. ONLY	TEACHERS WITH 10YR.+ EXPERIENCE
VIRGIN VALLEY HI/JR	17.5	17.7	19.8	18.9	0.0	22.2%	0.0	0.0	22.0%	53.0%
BROWN JR. HIGH	24.1	23.7	26.1	27.4	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	40.0%	49.0%
CANNON JR. HIGH	24.7	29.7	28.7	27.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	37.0%	46.0%
FREMONT JR. HIGH	24.3	24.6	24.1	38.5	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	26.0%	42.0%
GREENSPUN JR. HIGH	24.0	23.3	26.6	26.3	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	32.0%	46.0%
GUINN JR. HIGH	26.8	25.8	25.8	25.1	0.0	0.0	5.1%	0.0	43.0%	36.0%
HYDE PARK JR. HIGH	27.4	24.2	24.9	25.9	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	43.0%	43.0%
JOHNSON JR. HIGH	25.9	25.5	26.0	31.3	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	34.0%	54.0%
KNUDSON JR. HIGH	26.4	27.4	25.9	28.1	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	49.0%	49.0%
SANDY VALLEY JR HI	14.8	14.8	16.3	16.3	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	50.0%	25.0%
VON TOBEL JR. HIGH	27.1	26.8	28.1	26.7	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	55.0%	38.0%
BRIDGER MIDDLE S	26.3	26.1	22.9	25.1	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	43.0%	37.0%
BRINLEY MIDDLE S	26.8	27.1	26.8	26.8	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	46.0%	37.0%
BURKHOLDER MIDDLE	29.4	29.9	28.3	31.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	45.0%	30.0%
CASHMAN MIDDLE S	15.7	16.7	27.4	25.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	33.0%	53.0%
GARRETT MIDDLE S	21.7	23.2	20.6	25.4	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	35.0%	59.0%
GARSIDE MIDDLE S	26.2	26.0	25.5	27.7	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	35.0%	52.0%
GIBSON MIDDLE S	25.7	25.9	25.4	25.5	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	36.0%	46.0%
MARTIN MIDDLE S	20.5	22.8	23.0	25.4	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	44.0%	38.0%

SECONDARY CLASSROOMS

CLARK (CONT.)

SCHOOL	ENGLISH CL. SIZE	MATH CL. SIZE	SCIENCE CL. SIZE	SOC.SCI CL. SIZE	ENG. CL TAUGHT OUT LIC.	MATH CL TAUGHT OUT LIC.	SCI. CL TAUGHT OUT LIC.	SOC.SCI CL TAUGHT OUT LIC.	TEACHERS WITH B.A. ONLY	TEACHERS WITH 10YR.+ EXPERIENCE
OCALLAGHAN MIDDLE	24.7	24.9	25.3	25.6	0.0	0.0	14.3%	0.0	45.0	34.0
ORR MIDDLE S	24.6	28.4	26.9	25.8	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	60.0%	25.0%
ROBINSON MIDDLE S	29.9	30.3	26.3	33.6	0.0	0.0	0.0	20.8%	51.0%	32.0%
SMITH MIDDLE S	27.0	27.4	29.9	26.5	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	49.0%	28.0%
SWAINSTON MIDDLE	21.0	26.7	28.5	26.5	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	47.0%	29.0%
WHITE MIDDLE S	29.4	28.7	30.3	29.0	16.1%	0.0	0.0	0.0	60.0%	13.0%
WOODBURY MIDDLE	25.9	26.4	26.5	26.3	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	22.0%	61.0%
WASDEN JR. HIGH	NR	NR	NR	NR	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	56.0%	43.0%

SECONDARY CLASSROOMS

DOUGLAS

SCHOOL	ENGLISH CL. SIZE	MATH CL. SIZE	SCIENCE CL. SIZE	SOC.SCI CL. SIZE	ENG. CL TAUGHT OUT LIC.	MATH CL TAUGHT OUT LIC.	SCI. CL TAUGHT OUT LIC.	SOC.SCI CL TAUGHT OUT LIC.	TEACHERS WITH B.A. ONLY	TEACHERS WITH 10YR.+ EXPERIENCE
DOUGLAS HIGH	23.2	23.6	21.9	23.6	1.8%	0.0	2.7%	5.2%	56.0%	46.0%
WHITTELL HIGH	18.3	16.8	12.4	18.7	0.0	0.0	7.7%	0.0	47.0%	67.0%
CARSON VALLEY MID.	27.9	28.4	27.8	27.7	0.0	2.2%	4.4%	2.5%	79.0%	41.0%
KINGSBURY MIDDLE S	23.2	23.2	23.2	23.2	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	67.0%	33.0%

ELKO

SCHOOL	ENGLISH CL. SIZE	MATH CL. SIZE	SCIENCE CL. SIZE	SOC.SCI CL. SIZE	ENG. CL TAUGHT OUT LIC.	MATH CL TAUGHT OUT LIC.	SCI. CL TAUGHT OUT LIC.	SOC.SCI CL TAUGHT OUT LIC.	TEACHERS WITH B.A. ONLY	TEACHERS WITH 10YR.+ EXPERIENCE
ELKO HIGH	23.8	24.0	24.9	27.3	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	75.6%	52.6%
CARLIN COMP. SC	17.3	14.1	20.9	19.5	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	93.3%	26.7%
JACKPOT COMP. S	24.7	11.9	14.9	20.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	92.3%	30.8%
OWYHEE COMP. S	10.9	13.1	15.2	12.7	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	84.6%	46.1%
WELLS COMP. S	19.8	17.2	16.5	22.8	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	100.0%	50.0%
ELKO JUNIOR HIGH	23.1	23.0	24.7	25.6	0.0	0.0	0.0	1.0%	80.5%	41.5%

SECONDARY CLASSROOMS

EUREKA

SCHOOL	ENGLISH CL. SIZE	MATH CL. SIZE	SCIENCE CL. SIZE	SOC.SCI CL. SIZE	ENG. CL TAUGHT OUT LIC.	MATH CL TAUGHT OUT LIC.	SCI. CL TAUGHT OUT LIC.	SOC.SCI CL TAUGHT OUT LIC.	TEACHERS WITH B.A. ONLY	TEACHERS WITH 10YR.+ EXPERIENCE
EUREKA HIGH	15.3	10.8	9.7	20.4	10.0%	0.0	0.0	11.1%	84.6%	38.5%

HUMBOLDT

SCHOOL	ENGLISH CL. SIZE	MATH CL. SIZE	SCIENCE CL. SIZE	SOC.SCI CL. SIZE	ENG. CL TAUGHT OUT LIC.	MATH CL TAUGHT OUT LIC.	SCI. CL TAUGHT OUT LIC.	SOC.SCI CL TAUGHT OUT LIC.	TEACHERS WITH B.A. ONLY	TEACHERS WITH 10YR.+ EXPERIENCE
LOWRY HIGH	21.8	19.4	20.4	20.9	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	69.0%	43.0%
MCDERMITT	10.1	7.1	9.4	11.2	0.0	0.1%	0.0	0.0	76.0%	38.0%
WINNEMUCCA JR. HI	26.5	26.9	26.3	26.3	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	86.0%	45.0%

LANDER

SCHOOL	ENGLISH CL. SIZE	MATH CL. SIZE	SCIENCE CL. SIZE	SOC.SCI CL. SIZE	ENG. CL TAUGHT OUT LIC.	MATH CL TAUGHT OUT LIC.	SCI. CL TAUGHT OUT LIC.	SOC.SCI CL TAUGHT OUT LIC.	TEACHERS WITH B.A. ONLY	TEACHERS WITH 10YR.+ EXPERIENCE
BATTLE MT. HIGH	17.8	16.5	18.5	20.5	0.0	0.0	3.1%	0.0	95.0%	39.1%
AUSTIN HIGH/JR	8.7	8.7	8.7	9.4	100.0%	0.0	0.0	0.0	86.0%	25.0%
BATTLE MT. JR. HIGH	24.9	25.1	25.1	25.1	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	90.0%	38.9%

SECONDARY CLASSROOMS

LINCOLN

SCHOOL	ENGLISH CL. SIZE	MATH CL. SIZE	SCIENCE CL. SIZE	SOC.SCI CL. SIZE	ENG. CL TAUGHT OUT LIC.	MATH CL TAUGHT OUT LIC.	SCI. CL TAUGHT OUT LIC.	SOC.SCI CL TAUGHT OUT LIC.	TEACHERS WITH B.A. ONLY	TEACHERS WITH 10YR.+ EXPERIENCE
LINCOLN HIGH	18.0	12.1	12.3	21.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	56.0%	71.0%
PAHRANAGAT H/JR	17.8	8.1	9.2	18.4	NR	NR	NR	NR	54.0%	84.6%
MEADOW VALLEY MID	22.9	22.9	22.9	22.9	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	62.0%	46.0%

LYON

SCHOOL	ENGLISH CL. SIZE	MATH CL. SIZE	SCIENCE CL. SIZE	SOC.SCI CL. SIZE	ENG. CL TAUGHT OUT LIC.	MATH CL TAUGHT OUT LIC.	SCI. CL TAUGHT OUT LIC.	SOC.SCI CL TAUGHT OUT LIC.	TEACHERS WITH B.A. ONLY	TEACHERS WITH 10YR.+ EXPERIENCE
DAYTON HIGH	28.0	20.1	23.6	27.4	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	64.7%	64.7%
FERNLEY HIGH	14.9	18.8	18.1	16.4	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	74.1%	51.9%
YERINGTON HIGH	20.5	16.6	18.4	19.4	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	60.0%	65.0%
SMITH VALLEY COM S	18.2	18.8	19.7	20.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	82.4%	52.9%
DAYTON INTERMED	25.4	25.4	24.3	25.4	0.0	0.0	75.0%	0.0	68.2%	40.9%
FERNLEY INTERMED	23.7	26.9	25.9	23.7	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	82.1%	50.0%
YERINGTON INTERM	23.2	23.3	24.2	22.3	0.0	0.0	0.0	12.5%	100.0.%	36.0%

SECONDARY CLASSROOMS

MINERAL

SCHOOL	ENGLISH CL. SIZE	MATH CL. SIZE	SCIENCE CL. SIZE	SOC.SCI CL. SIZE	ENG. CL TAUGHT OUT LIC.	MATH CL TAUGHT OUT LIC.	SCI. CL TAUGHT OUT LIC.	SOC.SCI CL TAUGHT OUT LIC.	TEACHERS WITH B.A. ONLY	TEACHERS WITH 10YR.+ EXPERIENCE
MINERAL HIGH	23.4	19.8	19.4	24.5	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	73.6%	95.0%
HAWTHORNE ELEM	NR	NR	NR	NR	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	77.7%	62.2%
SCHURZ ELEM	NR	NR	NR	NR	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	75.0%	100.0%

NYE

SCHOOL	ENGLISH CL. SIZE	MATH CL. SIZE	SCIENCE CL. SIZE	SOC.SCI CL. SIZE	ENG. CL TAUGHT OUT LIC.	MATH CL TAUGHT OUT LIC.	SCI. CL TAUGHT OUT LIC.	SOC.SCI CL TAUGHT OUT LIC.	TEACHERS WITH B.A. ONLY	TEACHERS WITH 10YR.+ EXPERIENCE
BEATTY HIGH	18.8	13.3	16.5	22.3	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	80.0%	70.0%
GABBS HIGH	17.3	11.4	13.2	13.4	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	100.0%	33.0%
PAHRUMP HIGH	23.8	22.1	21.4	21.6	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	64.0%	68.0%
TONOPAH HIGH	15.1	6.4	7.7	11.8	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	76.4%	58.8%
ROUND MT. HIGH/JR.	17.8	10.1	9.1	17.5	16.7%	8.3%	0.0	0.0	92.3%	23.1%
PAHRUMP JR. HIGH	28.8	24.0	28.8	28.8	0.0	5.8%	0.0	0.0	58.8%	64.7%
ARMAGOSA VALLEY E	18.0	18.0	18.0	18.0	0.0	5.0%	0.0	0.0	70.0%	60.0%
BEATTY ELEM	12.3	12.3	12.3	12.3	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	86.6%	60.0%
TONOPAH ELEM	23.6	23.6	23.6	23.6	0.0	6.6%	0.0	0.0	76.5%	70.6%

SECONDARY CLASSROOMS

PERSHING

SCHOOL	ENGLISH CL. SIZE	MATH CL. SIZE	SCIENCE CL. SIZE	SOC.SCI CL. SIZE	ENG. CL TAUGHT OUT LIC.	MATH CL TAUGHT OUT LIC.	SCI. CL TAUGHT OUT LIC.	SOC.SCI CL TAUGHT OUT LIC.	TEACHERS WITH B.A. ONLY	TEACHERS WITH 10YR.+ EXPERIENCE
PERSHING HIGH	23.5	21.4	20.0	19.3	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	91.4%	57.2%
PERSHING MIDDLE S	NR	NR	NR	NR	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	82.3%	44.1%

STOREY

SCHOOL	ENGLISH CL. SIZE	MATH CL. SIZE	SCIENCE CL. SIZE	SOC.SCI CL. SIZE	ENG. CL TAUGHT OUT LIC.	MATH CL TAUGHT OUT LIC.	SCI. CL TAUGHT OUT LIC.	SOC.SCI CL TAUGHT OUT LIC.	TEACHERS WITH B.A. ONLY	TEACHERS WITH 10YR.+ EXPERIENCE
VIRGINIA CITY HIGH	18.8	17.6	16.8	20.3	20.0%	40.0%	0.0	0.0	45.0%	50.0%
VIRGINIA CITY MIDDLE	15.2	17.5	13.8	15.2	0.0	33.0%	0.0	43.0%	71.0%	43.0%

SECONDARY CLASSROOMS

WASHOE

SCHOOL	ENGLISH CL. SIZE	MATH CL. SIZE	SCIENCE CL. SIZE	SOC.SCI CL. SIZE	ENG. CL TAUGHT OUT LIC.	MATH CL TAUGHT OUT LIC.	SCI. CL TAUGHT OUT LIC.	SOC.SCI CL TAUGHT OUT LIC.	TEACHERS WITH B.A. ONLY	TEACHERS WITH 10YR.+ EXPERIENCE
GALENA HIGH	26.4	24.8	26.5	26.4	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	51.0%	30.0%
GERLACH HIGH	8.5	11.5	6.2	10.7	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	88.0%	12.0%
HUG HIGH	28.6	26.6	28.9	26.7	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	51.0%	44.0%
INCLINE HIGH	18.4	20.6	20.9	21.3	10.0%	0.0	0.0	0.0	41.0%	42.0%
MCQUEEN HIGH	27.0	28.6	26.7	26.6	0.0	0.0	0.0	3.0%	39.0%	43.0%
REED HIGH	27.7	28.1	27.3	30.2	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	39.0%	62.0%
RENO HIGH	26.7	28.5	26.6	27.6	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	29.0%	65.0%
SPARKS HIGH	27.2	28.5	30.6	28.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	47.0%	42.0%
WASHOE HIGH	NR	NR	NR	NR	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	48.0%	30.0%
WOOSTER HIGH	22.8	25.7	27.1	24.1	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	41.0%	53.0%
BILLINGHURST MID	27.7	28.4	29.9	29.8	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	53.0%	39.0%
CLAYTON MIDDLE	25.8	25.8	25.8	27.2	0.0	0.0	0.0	9.0%	42.0%	53.0%
DILWORTH MIDDLE	25.5	24.9	25.0	27.7	0.0	0.0	0.0	10.0%	59.0%	32.0%
INCLINE MIDDLE S	20.4	21.8	18.4	22.9	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	65.0%	31.0%
O'BRIEN MIDDLE S	25.1	25.8	29.2	26.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	61.0%	33.0%
PINE MIDDLE S	24.1	25.0	29.3	27.3	5.0%	0.0	11.0%	15.0%	55.0%	24.0%
SPARKS MIDDLE S	28.4	26.2	23.5	26.7	0.0	0.0	0.0	3.0%	48.0%	41.0%
SWOPE MIDDLE S	28.9	28.4	30.0	31.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	68.0%	18.0%
TRANER MIDDLE S	23.0	27.9	25.3	26.5	18.0%	12.0%	0.0	17.0%	53.0%	37.0%
VAUGHN MIDDLE S	24.4	28.5	24.4	24.1	19.0%	0.0	0.0	0.0	36.0%	35.0%

SECONDARY CLASSROOMS

WHITE PINE

SCHOOL	ENGLISH CL. SIZE	MATH CL. SIZE	SCIENCE CL. SIZE	SOC.SCI CL. SIZE	ENG. CL TAUGHT OUT LIC.	MATH CL TAUGHT OUT LIC.	SCI. CL TAUGHT OUT LIC.	SOC.SCI CL TAUGHT OUT LIC.	TEACHERS WITH B.A. ONLY	TEACHERS WITH 10YR.+ EXPERIENCE
LUND HIGH/JR	NR	NR	NR	NR	NR	NR	NR	NR	55.0%	45.0%
WHITE PINE HIGH	NR	NR	NR	NR	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	77.7%	53.0%
WHITE PINE MIDDLE S	26.3	25.5	26.5	26.3	NR	NR	NR	NR	91.7%	41.7%

Table C11 – SECONDARY STUDENT PARTICIPATION

CARSON

SCHOOL	SPECIAL EDUC.	ENG. AS SECOND LANG'GE	MIGRANT EDUC.	GIFTED PROG'M	MUSIC	ARTS	OCCUPA-TIONAL EDUC.	FOREIGN LANG.	ADVANC'D PLACEM'T CLASSES	STUDENT PARENTS	ATHLETIC
CARSON HIGH	8.7%	6.0%	3.1%	4.5%	10.6%	30.6%	9.2%	32.5%	13.7%	1.7%	86.7%
CARSON JR. HIGH	14.0%	3.1%	2.3%	4.6%	14.6%	26.3%	58.5%	9.5%	0.0	0.0	40.3%
EAGLE VALLEY JR.HI	13.5%	4.2%	1.2%	4.6%	21.1%	20.3%	71.4%	16.2%	11.7%	0.0	30.0%

CHURCHILL

SCHOOL	SPECIAL EDUC.	ENG. AS SECOND LANG'GE	MIGRANT EDUC.	GIFTED PROG'M	MUSIC	ARTS	OCCUPA-TIONAL EDUC.	FOREIGN LANG.	ADVANC'D PLACEM'T CLASSES	STUDENT PARENTS	ATHLETIC
CHURCHILL HIGH	9.2%	1.0%	2.3%	NR	18.8%	19.0%	71.0%	42.6%	4.6%	0.1%	57.2%
CHURCHILL JR HIGH	2.3%	0.0	1.6%	NR	24.7%	44.7%	47.5%	NR	NR	0.0	40.2%

SECONDARY STUDENT PARTICIPATION

CLARK

SCHOOL	SPECIAL EDUC.	ENG. AS SECOND LANG'GE	MIGRANT EDUC.	GIFTED PROG'M	MUSIC	ARTS	OCCUPA-TIONAL EDUC.	FOREIGN LANG.	ADVANC'D PLACEM'T CLASSES	STUDENT PARENTS	ATHLETIC
BASIC HIGH	6.0%	0.8%	0.0	5.8%	14.6%	15.8%	0.6%	24.5%	9.0%	4.6%	32.6%
BONANZA HIGH	5.9%	1.6%	0.0	7.6%	10.2%	17.9%	1.5%	32.9%	4.2%	0.0	31.9%
BOULDER HIGH	6.1%	0.3%	0.0	6.4%	6.1%	25.3%	0.8%	31.6%	0.0	0.0	81.2%
CHAPARRAL HIGH	4.0%	1.9%	0.2%	8.8%	13.6%	18.4%	1.0%	25.3%	10.6%	0.0	23.8%
CHEYENNE HIGH	7.9%	0.7%	0.0	4.5%	13.9%	11.2%	0.7%	26.5%	6.0%	0.0	31.1%
CIMARRON-MEMORIAL	4.6%	0.3%	0.0	5.3%	12.5%	16.0%	1.1%	32.0%	10.3%	0.0	29.9%
CLARK HIGH	5.0%	2.8%	0.0	5.6%	9.1%	18.8%	1.7%	24.9%	7.2%	0.6%	21.8%
ELDORADO HIGH	6.9%	1.6%	0.0	5.1%	15.1%	22.0%	1.1%	23.0%	9.7%	0.0	32.6%
GREEN VALLLEY HIGH	3.6%	0.3%	0.0	7.3%	12.2%	11.3%	0.4%	34.2%	10.9%	0.0	26.8%
HORIZON HIGH	NR	NR	NR	NR	NR	NR	NR	NR	NR	NR	NR
LAS VEGAS HIGH	6.3%	10.8%	0.0	4.1%	12.6%	22.8%	1.4%	20.3%	5.4%	0.9%	33.3%
RANCHO HIGH	8.0%	10.0%	0.0	1.8%	11.0%	17.0%	6.1%	16.4%	4.2%	10.4%	19.4%
SNVTC HIGH	7.4%	1.7%	0.0	2.4%	0.6%	26.9%	34.8%	1.1%	0.0	0.0	8.7%
SUNSET HIGH	NR	NR	NR	NR	NR	NR	NR	NR	NR	NR	NR
VALLEY HIGH	5.9%	6.8%	0.0	5.2%	12.0%	15.4%	1.4%	23.6%	7.9%	3.7%	25.2%
WESTERN HIGH	7.0%	2.7%	0.0	4.5%	10.3%	14.6%	1.6%	23.0%	6.0%	1.9%	30.1%
INDIAN SPRINGS HI/JR	21.1%	1.6%	0.0	3.2%	14.1%	9.2%	0.0	28.7%	0.0	0.0	75.1%
LAUGHLIN HIGH/JR	9.7%	1.2%	0.0	1.4%	17.9%	6.0%	0.0	16.7%	0.0	0.0	36.2%
MOAPA VALLEY HI/JR	7.1%	1.5%	1.7%	4.6%	51.1%	20.7%	4.5%	13.5%	0.6%	0.0	47.8%

SECONDARY STUDENT PARTICIPATION

CLARK (CONT.)

SCHOOL	SPECIAL EDUC.	ENG. AS SECOND LANG'GE	MIGRANT EDUC.	GIFTED PROG'M	MUSIC	ARTS	OCCUPA-TIONAL EDUC.	FOREIGN LANG.	ADVANC'D PLACEM'T CLASSES	STUDENT PARENTS	ATHLETIC
VIRGIN VALLEY HI/JR	9.2%	3.6%	4.6%	0.0	32.0%	16.4%	4.6%	16.6%	0.0	0.0	54.0%
BROWN JR. HIGH	10.7%	2.2%	0.0	5.4%	20.8%	0.6%	0.0	3.5%	0.0	0.0	0.0
CANNON JR. HIGH	6.2%	0.6%	0.0	14.5%	30.5%	0.2%	0.0	0.3%	0.0	0.0	0.0
FREMONT JR. HIGH	8.9%	14.0%	0.0	6.2%	21.7%	20.2%	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
GREENSPUN JR. HIGH	5.2%	0.2%	0.0	13.0%	37.2%	3.4%	0.0	6.9%	0.0	0.0	0.0
GUINN JR. HIGH	5.8%	1.5%	0.0	10.3%	29.6%	9.8%	0.0	13.0%	0.0	0.0	0.0
HYDE PARK JR. HIGH	12.2%	2.9%	0.0	6.0%	25.9%	9.1%	0.3%	11.1%	0.0	0.0	0.0
JOHNSON JR. HIGH	7.7%	0.4%	0.0	8.3%	37.2%	12.6%	0.0	4.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
KNUDSON JR. HIGH	11.5%	4.9%	0.0	8.3%	20.7%	3.0%	0.0	2.8%	0.0	0.0	0.0
SANDY VALLEY JR HI	10.3%	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
VON TOBEL JR. HIGH	11.5%	7.6%	0.0	3.0%	23.2%	18.4%	0.0	1.1%	0.0	0.0	0.0
BRIDGER MIDDLE S	7.9%	6.0%	0.0	2.7%	27.3%	36.8%	0.0	1.9%	0.0	0.0	0.0
BRINLEY MIDDLE S	5.3%	0.8%	0.0	8.4%	32.7%	7.4%	0.0	7.2%	0.0	0.0	0.0
BURKHOLDER MIDDLE	8.3%	0.2%	0.0	9.9%	22.3%	9.7%	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
CASHMAN MIDDLE S	9.5%	5.5%	0.0	5.4%	26.9%	7.3%	0.0	7.2%	0.0	0.0	0.0
GARRETT MIDDLE S	10.1%	0.2%	0.0	8.1%	17.6%	46.4%	0.0	8.1%	0.0	0.0	0.0
GARSIDE MIDDLE S	10.0%	0.2%	0.0	6.4%	61.6%	0.6%	0.0	13.1%	0.0	0.0	0.0
GIBSON MIDDLE S	11.4%	4.4%	0.0	4.6%	35.5%	50.8%	0.0	3.6%	0.0	0.0	0.0
MARTIN MIDDLE S	12.6%	19.9%	0.0	1.9%	13.1%	17.6%	0.0	6.0%	0.0	0.0	0.0

SECONDARY STUDENT PARTICIPATION

CLARK (CONT.)

SCHOOL	SPECIAL EDUC.	ENG. AS SECOND LANG'GE	MIGRANT EDUC.	GIFTED PROG'M	MUSIC	ARTS	OCCUPA-TIONAL EDUC.	FOREIGN LANG.	ADVANC'D PLACEM'T CLASSES	STUDENT PARENTS	ATHLETIC
OCALLAGHAN MIDDLE	8.4%	1.6%	0.0	9.2%	42.7%	8.9%	0.0	2.2%	0.0	0.0	0.0
ORR MIDDLE S	8.6%	13.3%	0.0	4.9%	15.6%	7.8%	0.0	2.0%	0.0	0.0	0.0
ROBINSON MIDDLE S	8.9%	4.2%	0.0	4.8%	40.6%	47.6%	0.0	7.9%	0.0	0.0	0.0
SMITH MIDDLE S	7.0%	12.8%	0.0	2.2%	21.7%	1.1%	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
SWAINSTON MIDDLE	10.2%	1.4%	0.0	4.6%	32.0%	8.5%	0.0	6.6%	0.0	0.0	0.0
WHITE MIDDLE S	6.8%	0.4%	0.0	13.0%	31.4%	5.6%	0.0	2.2%	0.0	0.0	0.0
WOODBURY MIDDLE	8.2%	1.4%	0.0	11.2%	34.2%	9.3%	0.0	6.7%	0.0	0.0	0.0
WASDEN JR. HIGH	17.3%	3.2%	0.0	12.8%	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0

DOUGLAS

SCHOOL	SPECIAL EDUC.	ENG. AS SECOND LANG'GE	MIGRANT EDUC.	GIFTED PROG'M	MUSIC	ARTS	OCCUPA-TIONAL EDUC.	FOREIGN LANG.	ADVANC'D PLACEM'T CLASSES	STUDENT PARENTS	ATHLETIC
DOUGLAS HIGH	5.6%	1.1%	0.0	0.0	9.0%	25.7%	25.8%	31.3%	7.0%	0.0	44.1%
WHITTELL HIGH	6.4%	6.8%	0.0	0.0	23.0%	36.7%	35.0%	23.7%	0.0	0.0	69.9%
CARSON VALLEY MID.	6.9%	0.6%	0.0	0.0	13.7%	5.8%	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	27.0%
KINGSBURY MIDDLE S	3.1%	4.9%	0.0	4.2%	91.9%	66.0%	0.0	12.9%	0.0	0.0	64.5%

SECONDARY STUDENT PARTICIPATION

ELKO

SCHOOL	SPECIAL EDUC.	ENG. AS SECOND LANG'GE	MIGRANT EDUC.	GIFTED PROG'M	MUSIC	ARTS	OCCUPA-TIONAL EDUC.	FOREIGN LANG.	ADVANC'D PLACEM'T CLASSES	STUDENT PARENTS	ATHLETIC
ELKO HIGH	5.0%	1.9%	0.0	0.0	27.0%	23.0%	100.0.%	40.0%	31.0%	3.0%	37.0%
CARLIN COMP. SC	10.1%	0.0	0.0	1.2%	70.5%	68.5%	100.0%	14.0%	12.0%	0.0	59.0%
JACKPOT COMP. S	11.0%	27.0%	0.0	0.0	50.0%	78.0%	82.0%	0.0	0.0	0.0	47.0%
OWYHEE COMP. S	12.8%	0.0	0.0	0.6%	77.5%	72.5%	95.0%	10.0%	5.0%	0.0	60.0%
WELLS COMP. S	14.7%	0.0	0.0	0.0	61.0%	74.0%	80.0%	32.0%	10.0%	0.0	63.0%
ELKO JUNIOR HIGH	6.2%	0.9%	0.0	0.0	29.0%	32.0%	44.0%	8.0%	30.0%	0.0	57.0%

EUREKA

SCHOOL	SPECIAL EDUC.	ENG. AS SECOND LANG'GE	MIGRANT EDUC.	GIFTED PROG'M	MUSIC	ARTS	OCCUPA-TIONAL EDUC.	FOREIGN LANG.	ADVANC'D PLACEM'T CLASSES	STUDENT PARENTS	ATHLETIC
EUREKA HIGH	18.1%	0.0	0.0	10.9%	5.8%	34.1%	84.8%	8.7%	2.9%	1.4%	85.5%

SECONDARY STUDENT PARTICIPATION

HUMBOLDT

SCHOOL	SPECIAL EDUC.	ENG. AS SECOND LANG'GE	MIGRANT EDUC.	GIFTED PROG'M	MUSIC	ARTS	OCCUPA-TIONAL EDUC.	FOREIGN LANG.	ADVANC'D PLACEM'T CLASSES	STUDENT PARENTS	ATHLETIC
LOWRY HIGH	8.0%	4.0%	0.0	0.0	19.0%	19.0%	0.0	39.0%	4.0%	0.0	39.0%
MCDERMITT	4.5%	12.5%	0.0	0.0	100.0%	100.0%	75.0%	NR	NR	NR	NR
WINNEMUCCA JR. HI	12.2%	3.6%	0.0	0.1%	22.9%	50.0%	27.6%	8.0%	17.3%	0.4%	26.7%

LANDER

SCHOOL	SPECIAL EDUC.	ENG. AS SECOND LANG'GE	MIGRANT EDUC.	GIFTED PROG'M	MUSIC	ARTS	OCCUPA-TIONAL EDUC.	FOREIGN LANG.	ADVANC'D PLACEM'T CLASSES	STUDENT PARENTS	ATHLETIC
BATTLE MT. HIGH	11.7%	1.7%	1.7%	0.0	24.6%	35.8%	69.6%	11.5%	0.0	0.0	45.0%
AUSTIN HIGH/JR	12.9%	0.0	0.0	0.0	27.4%	27.4%	93.5%	11.3%	0.0	0.0	83.9%
BATTLE MT. JR. HIGH	11.0%	0.0	1.9%	0.0	29.6%	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	38.1%

SECONDARY STUDENT PARTICIPATION

LINCOLN

SCHOOL	SPECIAL EDUC.	ENG. AS SECOND LANG'GE	MIGRANT EDUC.	GIFTED PROG'M	MUSIC	ARTS	OCCUPA-TIONAL EDUC.	FOREIGN LANG.	ADVANC'D PLACEM'T CLASSES	STUDENT PARENTS	ATHLETIC
LINCOLN HIGH	4.0%	0.0	0.0	0.0	20.0%	41.0%	83.0%	26.0%	0.0	0.0	71.0%
PAHRANAGAT HI/JR	13.0%	0.0	0.0	0.0	33.0%	17.0%	53.0%	3.0%	0.0	0.0	89.0%
MEADOW VALLEY MID	6.0%	0.0	0.0	0.0	19.0%	42.0%	100.0%	42.0%	0.0	0.0	43.0%

LYON

SCHOOL	SPECIAL EDUC.	ENG. AS SECOND LANG'GE	MIGRANT EDUC.	GIFTED PROG'M	MUSIC	ARTS	OCCUPA-TIONAL EDUC.	FOREIGN LANG.	ADVANC'D PLACEM'T CLASSES	STUDENT PARENTS	ATHLETIC
DAYTON HIGH	13.4%	0.6%	0.0	3.4%	18.1%	29.9%	58.9%	35.8%	0.0	0.0	43.9%
FERNLEY HIGH	11.9%	0.2%	0.0	2.1%	13.0%	5.3%	69.1%	23.0%	2.3%	0.2%	39.5%
YERINGTON HIGH	8.8%	1.8%	0.0	3.9%	17.8%	27.2%	68.6%	24.5%	0.0	0.0	48.3%
SMITH VALLEY COM S	15.1%	8.1%	0.0	7.8%	50.0%	50.0%	83.2%	19.3%	0.0	0.0	74.8%
DAYTON INTERMED	16.2%	0.0	0.0	3.2%	58.3%	50.0%	100.0%	0.0	0.0	0.0	50.8%
FERNLEY INTERMED	11.1%	2.8%	0.0	5.2%	50.0%	50.0%	100.0%	0.0	11.7%	0.0	70.4%
YERINGTON INTERM	12.7%	0.0	9.5%	3.9%	59.3%	50.0%	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	38.5%

SECONDARY STUDENT PARTICIPATION

MINERAL

SCHOOL	SPECIAL EDUC.	ENG. AS SECOND LANG'GE	MIGRANT EDUC.	GIFTED PROG'M	MUSIC	ARTS	OCCUPA-TIONAL EDUC.	FOREIGN LANG.	ADVANC'D PLACEM'T CLASSES	STUDENT PARENTS	ATHLETIC
MINERAL HIGH	NR	NR	NR	NR	NR	NR	NR	NR	NR	NR	NR
HAWTHORNE ELEM	NR	NR	NR	NR	NR	NR	NR	NR	NR	NR	NR
SCHURZ ELEM	NR	NR	NR	NR	NR	NR	NR	NR	NR	NR	NR

NYE

SCHOOL	SPECIAL EDUC.	ENG. AS SECOND LANG'GE	MIGRANT EDUC.	GIFTED PROG'M	MUSIC	ARTS	OCCUPA-TIONAL EDUC.	FOREIGN LANG.	ADVANC'D PLACEM'T CLASSES	STUDENT PARENTS	ATHLETIC
BEATTY HIGH	6.4%	0.0	0.0	0.0	29.0%	6.4%	100.0%	4.2%	0.7%	0.0	78.8%
GABBS HIGH	19.4%	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	11.3%	0.0	9.7%	0.0	0.0	65.0%
PAHRUMP HIGH	13.0%	0.0	0.0	0.0	20.3%	28.5%	77.6%	25.7%	0.0	0.0	48.0%
TONOPAH HIGH	11.2%	0.0	0.0	0.0	26.0%	39.0%	74.0%	22.8%	0.0	0.0	67.3%
ROUND MT. HIGH/JR.	7.9%	0.0	0.0	0.0	13.2%	10.5%	56.8%	8.4%	21.0%	0.0	50.0%
PAHRUMP JR. HIGH	9.4%	0.0	1.7%	0.0	39.6%	9.0%	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	65.3%
ARMAGOSA VALLEY E	13.3%	0.0	12.6%	0.0	0.0	0.0	---	---	---	---	---
BEATTY ELEM	5.8%	0.0	0.0	0.0	11.7%	0.0	---	---	---	---	---
TONOPAH ELEM	11.0%	0.0	0.0	0.0	100.0%	100.0%	---	---	---	---	---

SECONDARY STUDENT PARTICIPATION

PERSHING

SCHOOL	SPECIAL EDUC.	ENG. AS SECOND LANG'GE	MIGRANT EDUC.	GIFTED PROG'M	MUSIC	ARTS	OCCUPA-TIONAL EDUC.	FOREIGN LANG.	ADVANC'D PLACEM'T CLASSES	STUDENT PARENTS	ATHLETIC
PERSHING HIGH	10.7%	0.0	2.7%	0.0	14.4%	42.2%	47.6%	9.6%	0.0	0.0	49.2%
PERSHING MIDDLE S	20.1%	0.0	3.7%	0.0	16.5%	25.0%	87.7%	45.7%	0.0	0.0	54.3%

STOREY

SCHOOL	SPECIAL EDUC.	ENG. AS SECOND LANG'GE	MIGRANT EDUC.	GIFTED PROG'M	MUSIC	ARTS	OCCUPA-TIONAL EDUC.	FOREIGN LANG.	ADVANC'D PLACEM'T CLASSES	STUDENT PARENTS	ATHLETIC
VIRGINIA CITY HIGH	12.7%	0.0	0.0	0.0	63.7%	17.3%	0.0	0.0	3.1%	0.0	0.0
VIRGINIA CITY MIDDLE	15.0%	0.0	0.0	11.0%	35.0%	22.0%	0.0	0.0	----	----	0.0

SECONDARY STUDENT PARTICIPATION

WASHOE

SCHOOL	SPECIAL EDUC.	ENG. AS SECOND LANG'GE	MIGRANT EDUC.	GIFTED PROG'M	MUSIC	ARTS	OCCUPA-TIONAL EDUC.	FOREIGN LANG.	ADVANC'D PLACEM'T CLASSES	STUDENT PARENTS	ATHLETIC
GALENA HIGH	6.4%	2.2%	0.2%	0.1%	11.1%	17.6%	50.3%	52.3%	0.0	0.0	37.1%
GERLACH HIGH	2.7%	0.0	0.0	0.0	18.0%	15.0%	64.0%	38.0%	0.0	0.0	92.0%
HUG HIGH	12.8%	8.8%	0.0	1.1%	8.1%	27.1%	47.3%	27.5%	2.0%	0.0	24.5%
INCLINE HIGH	11.0%	2.4%	0.0	1.9%	21.0%	24.0%	17.2%	54.0%	15.0%	0.0	65.0%
MCQUEEN HIGH	4.3%	1.9%	0.3%	2.6%	31.0%	31.0%	35.0%	35.0%	16.0%	0.0	47.0%
REED HIGH	5.8%	1.1%	0.0	2.1%	14.0%	42.0%	10.0%	29.0%	5.0%	0.0	33.0%
RENO HIGH	5.6%	2.5%	0.7%	3.1%	12.0%	13.0%	17.0%	48.0%	28.0%	0.0	53.0%
SPARKS HIGH	7.6%	3.1%	0.2%	1.2%	9.0%	30.0%	34.0%	23.0%	6.0%	0.0	21.0%
WASHOE HIGH	10.0%	0.0	0.3%	1.6%	0.0%	0.0	3.1%	0.0	0.0	1.1%	0.0
WOOSTER HIGH	7.7%	6.5%	1.2%	1.7%	7.0%	41.0%	41.0%	35.0%	6.0%	0.0	32.0%
BILLINGHURST MID	10.7%	0.0	0.0	11.8%	35.4%	44.2%	100.0%	75.0%	0.0	0.0	36.0%
CLAYTON MIDDLE	7.4%	7.4%	0.3%	7.4%	37.0%	51.0%	58.0%	51.0%	0.0	0.0	32.3%
DILWORTH MIDDLE	12.0%	5.0%	0.3%	6.0%	42.0%	59.0%	75.0%	44.0%	0.0	0.0	41.0%
INCLINE MIDDLE S	14.0%	14.0%	0.0	19.0%	42.0%	59.3%	100.0%	26.0%	0.0	0.0	80.0%
O'BRIEN MIDDLE S	15.0%	0.0	0.0	6.0%	47.0%	69.0%	100.0%	45.0%	0.0	0.0	31.0%
PINE MIDDLE S	10.0%	4.6%	0.4%	8.3%	26.0%	24.8%	100.0%	31.9%	0.0	0.0	40.8%
SPARKS MIDDLE S	12.5%	0.0	0.0	20.5%	48.5%	23.5%	100.0%	50.0%	0.0	0.0	57.0%
SWOPE MIDDLE S	0.6%	0.2%	1.3%	11.3%	21.0%	38.0%	100.0%	66.0%	0.0	0.0	25.0%
TRANER MIDDLE S	16.0%	5.0%	3.2%	3.0%	32.0%	19.0%	95.0%	49.0%	0.0	0.0	35.0%
VAUGHN MIDDLE S	8.0%	6.0%	2.1%	6.0%	32.0%	43.0%	70.0%	35.0%	0.0	0.0	40.0%

SECONDARY STUDENT PARTICIPATION

WHITE PINE

SCHOOL	SPECIAL EDUC.	ENG. AS SECOND LANG'GE	MIGRANT EDUC.	GIFTED PROG'M	MUSIC	ARTS	OCCUPA-TIONAL EDUC.	FOREIGN LANG.	ADVANC'D PLACEM'T CLASSES	STUDENT PARENTS	ATHLETIC
LUND HIGH/JR	13.0%	0.0	0.0	0.0	65.0%	65.0%	57.0%	NR	NR	NR	NR
WHITE PINE HIGH	6.0%	0.0	0.0	0.0	24.0%	20.0%	83.0%	NR	20.0%	0.0	43.0%
WHITE PINE MIDDLE S	8.3%	NR	NR	NR	49.2%	50.9%	NR	NR	NR	NR	40.7%

Table C12 – SECONDARY STUDENT PERFORMANCE

CARSON

	AVE. %TILE		% OF 9TH GRADERS COMPETENT					% SENIORS PASSING							
SCHOOL	READ GR.9	MATH GR.9	WRITE IDEAS	WRITE ORGAN.	WRITE VOICE	WRITE CONVEN -TION	DROP OUT RATE	READ PROFI CIENT	MATH PROFI CIENT	WRITE PROFI CIENT	% SR'S TAKING ACT	ACT AVE	% SR'S TAKING SAT	SAT VER- BAL	SAT MATH
CARSON HIGH	---	---	---	---	---	---	7.0%	100%	100%	100%	51%	21.0	46%	416	472
CARSON JH.	54%	52%	61.4%	60.6%	74.9%	79.5%	0.2%	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---
EAGLE VALLEY JH	56%	49%	80.5%	75.6%	90.0%	81.9%	0.6%	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---

CHURCHILL

	AVE. %TILE		% OF 9TH GRADERS COMPETENT					% SENIORS PASSING							
SCHOOL	READ GR.9	MATH GR.9	WRITE IDEAS	WRITE ORGAN.	WRITE VOICE	WRITE CONVEN -TION	DROP OUT RATE	READ PROFI CIENT	MATH PROFI CIENT	WRITE PROFI CIENT	% SR'S TAKING ACT	ACT AVE	% SR'S TAKING SAT	SAT VER- BAL	SAT MATH
CHURCHILL HIGH	NR	NR	68.6%	62.8%	68.6%	70.8%	6.7%	98.4%	97.9%	98.4%	53%	21.6	24%	431	478

SECONDARY STUDENT PERFORMANCE

CLARK

	AVE. %TILE		% OF 9TH GRADERS COMPETENT					% SENIORS PASSING							
SCHOOL	READ GR.9	MATH GR.9	WRITE IDEAS	WRITE ORGAN.	WRITE VOICE	WRITE CONVEN -TION	DROP OUT RATE	READ PROFI CIENT	MATH PROFI CIENT	WRITE PROFI CIENT	% SR'S TAKING ACT	ACT AVE	% SR'S TAKING SAT	SAT VER-BAL	SAT MATH
BASIC HIGH	58%	61%	66.2%	67.7%	75.4%	75.2%	7.9%	97.1%	96.5%	96.8%	47%	20.8	13%	431	516
BONANZA HIGH	66%	72%	69.0%	67.7%	78.8%	78.6%	5.3%	98.4%	97.9%	99.0%	48%	21.6	37%	431	498
BOULDER CITY H	66%	69%	72.3%	68.1%	75.3%	77.7%	2.4%	96.6%	96.6%	97.3%	49%	23.0	60%	448	500
CHAPARRAL HIGH	62%	68%	74.1%	70.0%	82.4%	77.2%	6.4%	97.0%	97.4%	98.8%	53%	21.2	32%	433	490
CHEYENNE HIGH	51%	49%	64.0%	60.4%	80.9%	71.0%	6.5%	93.7%	93.7%	96.2%	46%	20.6	33%	424	487
CIMARRON HIGH	61%	58%	69.6%	67.7%	81.0%	80.3%	5.5%	98.9%	98.4%	98.9%	41%	20.8	24%	418	477
CLARK HIGH	52%	54%	68.5%	71.2%	78.2%	73.9%	9.0%	96.7%	98.5%	97.9%	43%	22.0	30%	435	506
ELDORADO HIGH	54%	55%	62.3%	58.2%	75.8%	72.7%	6.5%	97.6%	98.1%	99.2%	35%	20.6	27%	396	445
GREEN VALLEY H	70%	75%	80.0%	77.5%	87.2%	86.0%	3.6%	98.2%	97.9%	98.0%	58%	21.5	49%	444	515
HORIZON HIGH	NR	NR	NR	NR	NR	NR	NR	NR	NR	NR	NR	NR	NR	NR	NR
LAS VEGAS HIGH	45%	46%	59.8%	58.1%	77.3%	64.9%	13.5%	96.1%	95.9%	94.8%	34%	20.6	22%	431	477
RANCHO HIGH	38%	41%	56.4%	50.6%	70.0%	53.7%	12.3%	88.9%	94.6%	92.5%	36%	20.4	19%	419	494
SNVTC HIGH	----	----	----	----	----	----	4.5%	99.3%	100%	99.7%	20%	18.5	3%	441	515
SUNSET HIGH	NR	NR	NR	NR	NR	NR	NR	NR	NR	NR	NR	NR	NR	NR	NR
VALLEY HIGH	51%	53%	66.7%	63.0%	80.4%	68.8%	10.5%	95.0%	95.6%	96.3%	38%	20.6	30%	421	494
WESTERN HIGH	50%	45%	68.0%	62.5%	83.9%	66.5%	6.9%	96.0%	96.6%	98.1%	43%	21.5	21%	453	508
INDIAN SPRINGS H	69%	56%	64.0%	68.0%	84.0%	68.0%	4.4%	100%	100%	100%	45%	19.1	0	0	0
LAUGHLIN HIGH	46%	44%	41.9%	46.5%	69.8%	60.5%	4.7%	93.3%	93.3%	95.6%	24%	18.6	22%	328	391
MOAPA VALLEY	66%	60%	76.8%	66.1%	86.1%	76.8%	1.2%	100%	100%	100%	81%	20.6	0	0	0

SECONDARY STUDENT PERFORMANCE

CLARK

	AVE. %TILE		% OF 9TH GRADERS COMPETENT					% SENIORS PASSING							
SCHOOL	READ GR.9	MATH GR.9	WRITE IDEAS	WRITE ORGAN.	WRITE VOICE	WRITE CONVEN -TION	DROP OUT RATE	READ PROFI CIENT	MATH PROFI CIENT	WRITE PROFI CIENT	% SR'S TAKING ACT	ACT AVE	% SR'S TAKING SAT	SAT VER-BAL	SAT MATH
VIRGIN VALLEY H	68%	61%	71.9%	67.2%	87.5%	78.1%	8.0%	95.8%	97.9%	97.9%	83%	19.2	0	0	0
CANNON JH	NR	NR	NR	NR	NR	NR	NR	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---
GUINN JH	NR	NR	NR	NR	NR	NR	NR	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---
HYDE PARK JH	NR	NR	NR	NR	NR	NR	NR	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---
KNUDSON JH	NR	NR	NR	NR	NR	NR	NR	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---
SANDY VALLEY JH	NR	NR	NR	NR	NR	NR	NR	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---

DOUGLAS

	AVE. %TILE		% OF 9TH GRADERS COMPETENT					% SENIORS PASSING							
SCHOOL	READ GR.9	MATH GR.9	WRITE IDEAS	WRITE ORGAN.	WRITE VOICE	WRITE CONVEN -TION	DROP OUT RATE	READ PROFI CIENT	MATH PROFI CIENT	WRITE PROFI CIENT	% SR'S TAKING ACT	ACT AVE	% SR'S TAKING SAT	SAT VER-BAL	SAT MATH
DOUGLAS HIGH	56%	64%	76.0%	75.0%	84.0%	80.0%	4.8%	99.1%	99.1%	100%	37%	21.9	21%	456	520
WHITTELL HIGH	54%	48%	85.0%	82.0%	83.0%	82.0%	4.0%	100%	98.6%	99.3%	46%	21.4	49%	435	474

SECONDARY STUDENT PERFORMANCE

ELKO

	AVE. %TILE		% OF 9TH GRADERS COMPETENT					% SENIORS PASSING							
SCHOOL	READ GR.9	MATH GR.9	WRITE IDEAS	WRITE ORGAN.	WRITE VOICE	WRITE CONVEN -TION	DROP OUT RATE	READ PROFI CIENT	MATH PROFI CIENT	WRITE PROFI CIENT	% SR'S TAKING ACT	ACT AVE	% SR'S TAKING SAT	SAT VER-BAL	SAT MATH
ELKO HIGH	60%	67%	75.5%	69.9%	86.9%	78.5%	6.0%	98.2%	98.2%	99.4%	40%	21.7	14%	450	517
CARLIN COMPLETE	49%	59%	56.5%	58.7%	67.4%	71.7%	3.0%	93.3%	96.7%	100%	37%	19.4	11%	410	450
JACKPOT COMP. S	28%	71%	69.2%	69.2%	76.9%	53.8%	16.0%	92.3%	92.3%	92.3%	50%	17.8	0	0	0
OWYHEE COMP. S	56%	40%	36.8%	57.9%	63.2%	78.9%	6.0%	93.8%	75.0%	81.3%	50%	20.5	0	0	0
WELLS COMPLETE	67%	63%	56.8%	56.8%	73.0%	83.8%	4.0%	100%	100%	96.4%	58%	19.1	0	0	0

EUREKA

	AVE. %TILE		% OF 9TH GRADERS COMPETENT					% SENIORS PASSING							
SCHOOL	READ GR.9	MATH GR.9	WRITE IDEAS	WRITE ORGAN.	WRITE VOICE	WRITE CONVEN -TION	DROP OUT RATE	READ PROFI CIENT	MATH PROFI CIENT	WRITE PROFI CIENT	% SR'S TAKING ACT	ACT AVE	% SR'S TAKING SAT	SAT VER-BAL	SAT MATH
EUREKA HIGH	68%	56%	74.0%	74.0%	90.0%	90.0%	2.2%	100%	100%	100%	63%	21.9	69%	392	435

SECONDARY STUDENT PERFORMANCE

HUMBOLDT

	AVE. %TILE		% OF 9TH GRADERS COMPETENT					% SENIORS PASSING							
SCHOOL	READ GR.9	MATH GR.9	WRITE IDEAS	WRITE ORGAN.	WRITE VOICE	WRITE CONVEN -TION	DROP OUT RATE	READ PROFI CIENT	MATH PROFI CIENT	WRITE PROFI CIENT	% SR'S TAKING ACT	ACT AVE	% SR'S TAKING SAT	SAT VER-BAL	SAT MATH
LOWRY HIGH	51%	50%	64.3%	61.2%	84.7%	78.1%	4.0%	98.0%	99.3%	100%	65%	21.1	30%	436	462
MCDERMITT COMP.	47%	40%	58.3%	58.3%	91.7%	83.3%	1.4%	100%	100%	100%	39%	16.1	6%	420	520

LANDER

	AVE. %TILE		% OF 9TH GRADERS COMPETENT					% SENIORS PASSING							
SCHOOL	READ GR.9	MATH GR.9	WRITE IDEAS	WRITE ORGAN.	WRITE VOICE	WRITE CONVEN -TION	DROP OUT RATE	READ PROFI CIENT	MATH PROFI CIENT	WRITE PROFI CIENT	% SR'S TAKING ACT	ACT AVE	% SR'S TAKING SAT	SAT VER-BAL	SAT MATH
BATTLE MT. HIGH	51%	61%	74.6%	75.4%	87.7%	83.3%	7.0%	100%	100%	100%	53%	20.0	2%	310	270
AUSTIN HIGH/JH	48%	61%	42.7%	57.1%	85.7%	42.9%	5.0%	100%	100%	100%	75%	19.0	0	0	0

LINCOLN

	AVE. %TILE		% OF 9TH GRADERS COMPETENT					% SENIORS PASSING							
SCHOOL	READ GR.9	MATH GR.9	WRITE IDEAS	WRITE ORGAN.	WRITE VOICE	WRITE CONVEN -TION	DROP OUT RATE	READ PROFI CIENT	MATH PROFI CIENT	WRITE PROFI CIENT	% SR'S TAKING ACT	ACT AVE	% SR'S TAKING SAT	SAT VER-BAL	SAT MATH
LINCOLN HIGH	65%	60%	60.0%	71.0%	69.0%	80.0%	0.1%	100%	100%	100%	71%	19.7	0	0	0
PAHRANAGAT H	70%	72%	85.0%	74.0%	74.0%	85.0%	0.0	100%	100%	100%	48%	22.5	0	0	0

SECONDARY STUDENT PERFORMANCE

LYON

	AVE. %TILE		% OF 9TH GRADERS COMPETENT					% SENIORS PASSING							
SCHOOL	READ GR.9	MATH GR.9	WRITE IDEAS	WRITE ORGAN.	WRITE VOICE	WRITE CONVEN -TION	DROP OUT RATE	READ PROFI CIENT	MATH PROFI CIENT	WRITE PROFI CIENT	% SR'S TAKING ACT	ACT AVE	% SR'S TAKING SAT	SAT VER-BAL	SAT MATH
DAYTON HIGH	53%	45%	62.8%	62.8%	72.1%	70.9%	8.3%	91.3%	93.7%	95.8%	34%	22.0	17%	442	456
FERNLEY HIGH	55%	48%	69.3%	65.8%	86.0%	74.6%	11.2%	94.4%	93.0%	100%	51%	21.0	33%	432	473
YERINGTON HIGH	55%	46%	71.4%	70.2%	76.2%	76.2%	7.5%	96.8%	93.8%	98.8%	40%	21.0	0	0	0
SMITH VALLEY CS	56%	55%	90.5%	61.9%	100%	76.2%	1.3%	100%	100%	100%	60%	23.4	47%	452	552

MINERAL

	AVE. %TILE		% OF 9TH GRADERS COMPETENT					% SENIORS PASSING							
SCHOOL	READ GR.9	MATH GR.9	WRITE IDEAS	WRITE ORGAN.	WRITE VOICE	WRITE CONVEN -TION	DROP OUT RATE	READ PROFI CIENT	MATH PROFI CIENT	WRITE PROFI CIENT	% SR'S TAKING ACT	ACT AVE	% SR'S TAKING SAT	SAT VER-BAL	SAT MATH
MINERAL HIGH	49%	44%	22.7%	20.2%	27.8%	18.0%	10.4%	92.0%	93.0%	97.0%	0	0.0	0	0	0

SECONDARY STUDENT PERFORMANCE

NYE

	AVE. %TILE		% OF 9TH GRADERS COMPETENT					% SENIORS PASSING							
SCHOOL	READ GR.9	MATH GR.9	WRITE IDEAS	WRITE ORGAN.	WRITE VOICE	WRITE CONVEN -TION	DROP OUT RATE	READ PROFI CIENT	MATH PROFI CIENT	WRITE PROFI CIENT	% SR'S TAKING ACT	ACT AVE	% SR'S TAKING SAT	SAT VER-BAL	SAT MATH
BEATTY HIGH	42%	50%	74.3%	65.7%	77.1%	82.9%	NR	100%	100%	100%	37%	19.3	58%	409	448
GABBS HIGH	51%	50%	50.0%	35.0%	90.0%	65.0%	0.0	100%	100%	100%	92%	17.1	0	0	0
PAHRUMP HIGH	49%	41%	62.1%	49.2%	78.0%	59.8%	6.4%	62.9%	57.6%	58.3%	30%	18.8	3%	380	370
TONOPAH HIGH	59%	55%	50.0%	50.0%	78.3%	56.5%	NR	100%	100%	100%	36%	21.2	21%	433	432
ROUND MT. HIGH	46%	47%	75.7%	70.2%	94.6%	89.2%	3.0%	100%	100%	100%	73%	19.2	0	0	0

PERSHING

	AVE. %TILE		% OF 9TH GRADERS COMPETENT					% SENIORS PASSING							
SCHOOL	READ GR.9	MATH GR.9	WRITE IDEAS	WRITE ORGAN.	WRITE VOICE	WRITE CONVEN -TION	DROP OUT RATE	READ PROFI CIENT	MATH PROFI CIENT	WRITE PROFI CIENT	% SR'S TAKING ACT	ACT AVE	% SR'S TAKING SAT	SAT VER-BAL	SAT MATH
PERSHING HIGH	48%	42%	68.0%	62.0%	80.0%	70.0%	3.1%	100%	100%	100%	81%	19.1	22%	471	521

SECONDARY STUDENT PERFORMANCE

STOREY

	AVE. %TILE		% OF 9TH GRADERS COMPETENT					% SENIORS PASSING							
SCHOOL	READ GR.9	MATH GR.9	WRITE IDEAS	WRITE ORGAN.	WRITE VOICE	WRITE CONVEN -TION	DROP OUT RATE	READ PROFI CIENT	MATH PROFI CIENT	WRITE PROFI CIENT	% SR'S TAKING ACT	ACT AVE	% SR'S TAKING SAT	SAT VER- BAL	SAT MATH
VIRGINIA CITY HI	51%	51%	NR	NR	NR	NR	8.3%	100%	100%	100%	37%	18.5	0	0	0

SECONDARY STUDENT PERFORMANCE

WASHOE

	AVE. %TILE		% OF 9TH GRADERS COMPETENT					% SENIORS PASSING							
SCHOOL	READ GR.9	MATH GR.9	WRITE IDEAS	WRITE ORGAN.	WRITE VOICE	WRITE CONVEN -TION	DROP OUT RATE	READ PROFI CIENT	MATH PROFI CIENT	WRITE PROFI CIENT	% SR'S TAKING ACT	ACT AVE	% SR'S TAKING SAT	SAT VER- BAL	SAT MATH
GALENA HIGH	66%	58%	75.8%	70.2%	86.2%	77.9%	1.8%	98.0%	97.0%	99.0%	----	----	----	----	----
GERLACH HIGH	71%	64%	72.7%	81.8%	100%	81.8%	5.7%	100%	100%	100%	0	----	0	----	----
HUG HIGH	46%	46%	53.6%	49.9%	68.6%	56.8%	7.4%	97.0%	96.0%	99.0%	27%	20.4	21%	404	461
INCLINE HIGH	66%	69%	69.9%	72.0%	84.9%	78.5%	1.6%	100%	100%	100%	49%	21.7	71%	460	497
MCQUEEN HIGH	70%	70%	83.3%	80.7%	87.2%	86.9%	3.6%	99.0%	98.0%	99.0%	49%	23.0	31%	477	516
REED HIGH	64%	62%	72.9%	70.6%	83.3%	80.1%	2.2%	99.0%	99.0%	99.0%	43%	21.0	32%	432	505
RENO HIGH	68%	68%	80.7%	76.7%	87.3%	84.0%	2.4%	98.0%	97.0%	99.0%	50%	22.0	52%	471	510
SPARKS HIGH	53%	56%	69.2%	66.7%	80.5%	74.2%	7.1%	99.0%	99.0%	99.0%	39%	19.3	32%	380	444
WASHOE HIGH	26%	21%	46.6%	35.7%	71.4%	53.6%	44.4%	94.0%	97.0%	99.0%	2%	21.8	1%	365	360
WOOSTER HIGH	49%	54%	62.5%	58.6%	77.8%	66.7%	5.3%	98.0%	94.0%	98.0%	28%	21.2	28%	420	477

WHITE PINE

	AVE. %TILE		% OF 9TH GRADERS COMPETENT					% SENIORS PASSING							
SCHOOL	READ GR.9	MATH GR.9	WRITE IDEAS	WRITE ORGAN.	WRITE VOICE	WRITE CONVEN -TION	DROP OUT RATE	READ PROFI CIENT	MATH PROFI CIENT	WRITE PROFI CIENT	% SR'S TAKING ACT	ACT AVE	% SR'S TAKING SAT	SAT VER- BAL	SAT MATH
LUND HIGH/JH	69%	40%	NR	NR	NR	NR	9.7%	NR	NR	NR	NR	NR	NR	NR	NR
WHITE PINE HIGH	53%	51%	NR	NR	NR	NR	5.3%	NR	NR	NR	NR	NR	NR	NR	NR

Appendix D

Table D1. Partial correlations from Multiple Regression/Correlation analyses of relationships between school characteristics and national percentile rank of average CTBS scores at grades three and six.

School Characteristic	Gr.3 Read	Gr.3 Math	Gr.3 Lang	Gr.6 Read	Gr.6 Math	Gr.6 Lang
Per Pupil Expenditure for Instruction	.05	**-.18**	-.13	.11	.05	.12
Transiency Rate	**-.20**	**-.16**	-.08	-.03	-.11	-.09
% Parents Attending Parent/Teacher Conference	**.18**	**.34**	**.22**	**.34**	**.23**	**.29**
Annual Enrollment Change	**.16**	.02	.06	-.12	-.10	-.09
% in Migrant Education	-.09	-.14	-.07	**-.37**	**-.22**	**-.31**
% in Special Education	-.02	.08	-.06	.04	-.06	-.07
% Teachers with B.A. Only	**-.16**	**-.34**	**-.26**	-.01	-.18	.08
Attendance Rate	**.50**	**.36**	**.44**	.01	-.19	.10
% Teachers Teaching within License Area	-.10	**-.26**	**-.16**	-.03	-.10	.03
% Teachers with 10+ Years Experience	**.18**	.08	.03	.02	-.07	.08
% in Gifted/Talented	**.30**	**.36**	**.19**	**.31**	**.42**	**.38**
% in English as Second Language	**-.17**	.06	-.06	-.03	-.07	.06
School Enrollment	.14	**.22**	.07	**-.22**	-.09	-.13
% in Free/Reduced Lunch	**-.39**	**-.28**	**-.45**	**-.44**	**-.23**	**-.25**
Gr.3 Promotions	-.12	.02	-.13	-----	-----	-----
Gr.6 Promotions	-----	-----	-----	.12	-.02	.08
Gr.3 Teacher/Student Ratio	-.06	**-.25**	-.08	-----	-----	-----
Gr.6 Teacher/Student Ratio	-----	-----	-----	**.24**	.17	.15

*** (p<.05)**

Table D2. Partial correlations from Multiple Regression/Correlation analyses of relationships between school characteristics and national percentile rank of average CTBS scores at grade nine.

School Characteristic	Grade 9 Reading	Grade 9 Mathematics
Per Pupil Expenditure for Instruction	.37	.00
Transiency Rate	.32	.16
% Parents Attending Parent/Teacher Conference	.27	**.43**
Annual Enrollment Change	-.10	-.05
% in Migrant Education	.22	.13
% in Special Education	.08	-.05
% Teachers with B.A. Only	-.36	-.02
Attendance Rate	**.47**	.28
% Students in Advanced Placement Programs	**.48**	.37
% Teachers with 10+ Years Experience	.11	.07
% in Gifted/Talented	**.42**	.33
% in English as Second Language	**-.58**	.06
School Enrollment	.11	.25
% of English Classes Taught by Teachers Outside of Their License Area	-.08	----
English Class Size	-.15	----
% of Mathematics Classes Taught by Teachers Outside of Their License Area	----	.06
Mathematics Class Size	----	-.21

*** (p<.05)**

Table D3. Partial correlations from Multiple Regression/Correlation analyses of relationships between school characteristics and the percentage of sixth grade students considered competent in writing traits on the statewide Writing Exam.

School Characteristic	Grade 6 IDEA	Grade 6 CONVEN -TION	Grade 6 ORGANI -ZATION	Grade 6 VOICE
Per Pupil Expenditure for Instruction	**.31**	**.29**	**.24**	**.41**
Transiency Rate	**-.26**	**-.24**	**-.22**	**-.29**
% Parents Attending Parent/Teacher Conference	.03	.11	.14	-.05
Annual Enrollment Change	.20	.19	.14	.15
% in Migrant Education	.06	-.17	-.15	-.03
% in Special Education	**-.31**	**-.24**	-.20	-.17
% Teachers with B.A. Only	-.04	.04	.10	.04
Attendance Rate	.18	.13	.16	.10
% Teachers Teaching within License Area	**.24**	.19	.17	**.25**
% Teachers with 10+ Years Experience	-.16	-.03	.08	-.12
% in Gifted/Talented	**.44**	**.29**	**.40**	**.34**
% in English as Second Language	-.05	-.17	-.11	-.06
School Enrollment	**-.34**	-.19	**-.25**	-.09
% in Free/Reduced Lunch	.00	.02	.05	-.06
Gr.6 Promotions	-.02	.00	.04	.00
Gr.6 Teacher/Student Ratio	**.41**	**.29**	**.35**	**.34**

*** (p<.05)**

Table D4. Partial correlations from Multiple Regression/Correlation analyses of relationships between school characteristics and the percentage of ninth grade students considered competent in writing traits on the statewide Writing Exam.

School Characteristic	Grade 9 IDEA	Grade 9 CONVEN -TION	Grade 9 ORGANI -ZATION	Grade 9 VOICE
Per Pupil Expenditure for Instruction	.25	**.41**	**.42**	.14
Transiency Rate	-.01	.24	.34	-.01
% Parents Attending Parent/Teacher Conference	.17	.36	**.62**	-.03
Annual Enrollment Change	.15	.10	.15	.10
% in Migrant Education	.33	.28	.30	.20
% in Special Education	-.22	-.20	-.35	-.01
% Teachers with B.A. Only	-.24	-.23	-.27	-.20
Attendance Rate	.33	**.42**	**.58**	.23
% Students in Advanced Placement Programs	**.46**	**.62**	**.59**	.39
% Teachers with 10+ Years Experience	.08	-.27	.00	-.40
% in Gifted/Talented	.38	**.44**	**.41**	.20
% in English as Second Language	.24	-.37	.13	.08
School Enrollment	-.09	.03	.14	.02
English Class Size	.12	-.10	-.03	-.22
% English Classes Taught by Teachers Outside of License	-.12	-.39	.15	-.02

*** (p<.05)**